

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the post-office nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBINSON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 15, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 14, 1935

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James D. McEachern, Brundige.
Levie C. Sirmon, Dozier.
Willie W. Whittaker, Flomaton.

GEORGIA

Howard Perry, Ellijay.
Jessie T. Freeman, Greenville.
Marion Lott, Hahira.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ray A. Hicks, Colebrook.
Harry W. Ladd, Plaistow.
James R. Kill Kelley, Wilton.

OKLAHOMA

Rosa B. Britton, Cyril.

TENNESSEE

Shelbin C. Malone, Henderson.

TEXAS

William D. Reed, Holland.
John W. Hardison, Whitney.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift our breath in prayer to Thee, O God. We thank Thee that the still, small voice speaks not in stormy haste. Thou dost arouse spiritual emotions in the patient, waiting soul. So, Heavenly Father, we look up to Thee, dreaming and doing, thinking and working, and we pray that the unity of these may exist in our thoughts, each keeping the other strong and pure. We beseech Thee to save us from the oppression that drowns and bewilders and to let fall Thy radiant beams upon our pathway. Inspire us with the love that honors law and with that power that lifts man upward. Heavenly Father, in the past Thou didst walk with our humanity "in the cool of the day amongst the trees in the garden." Be merciful to give us an abiding sense of Thy presence and let us hear Thy welcome footfall in the garden of our earthly lives. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 2030. An act authorizing the States of Washington and Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho;

H. R. 2874. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Eleven Points River in section 17, township 23 north, range 2 west, approximately 12 miles east of Alton, on route no. 42, Oregon County, Mo.;

H. R. 3018. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 3057. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oklahoma to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Arkansas River south of the town of Sallisaw in Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties at a point approximately 15 miles north of Keota in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 3465. An act permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3891. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Waccamaw River at Conway, S. C.;

H. R. 3983. An act to legalize a bridge (known as "Union Street Bridge") across the Dan River at Danville, Va.; and

H. R. 4018. An act to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 31. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Chester C. Groff;

S. 250. An act authorizing the Brookewell Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.;

S. 266. An act to provide for the erection of a public historical museum in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, Mont.;

S. 274. An act for the relief of Charles C. Floyd;

S. 347. An act for the relief of James J. Jordan;

S. 567. An act for the relief of Sarah Lloyd;

S. 633. An act for the relief of Isaac Pierce;

S. 634. An act to authorize the sale of a portion of the Fort Smith National Cemetery Reservation, Ark., and for other purposes;

S. 651. An act for the relief of Harry Flanery;

S. 653. An act for the relief of James W. Carmichael, deceased;

S. 732. An act for the relief of Zinsser & Co.;

S. 733. An act for the relief of William Burke;

S. 735. An act for the relief of Wiener Bank Verein;

S. 737. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, as amended;

S. 746. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Thomas, alias Joseph Thomas, alias Thomas O'Donnell;

S. 812. An act authorizing the Arizona State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Colorado River at or near Parker, Ariz., within the Colorado River Indian Reservation;

S. 871. An act authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Alvin C. York as a major in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list;

S. 886. An act for the relief of Marino Ambrogio;

S. 887. An act for the relief of Edward T. Costello;

S. 888. An act for the relief of Joseph Gorman;

S. 889. An act for the relief of Albert A. Marquardt;

S. 890. An act for the relief of Michael J. Moran;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Hector H. Perry;

S. 893. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Sullivan;

S. 920. An act for the relief of Ruth J. Barnes;

S. 943. An act to amend section 21 of the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 945. An act to amend sections 11 and 24 of the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 999. An act for the relief of Judson B. Isbester;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of George W. Baker;

S. 1019. An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate

Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes;

S. 1076. An act relating to the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees;

S. 1144. An act to further extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo.;

S. 1176. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Coyne;

S. 1222. An act to further extend the times for commencement and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.;

S. 1300. An act to amend the War Department appropriation act relative to the operation of motor-propelled vehicles;

S. 1301. An act to provide further for the maintenance of United States Soldiers' Home;

S. 1302. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1304. An act to amend section 47c, National Defense Act, as amended, relating to military training required to entitled members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps to receive commutation of subsistence;

S. 1308. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill.;

S. 1309. An act to amend section 114 of the Judicial Code to provide for terms of District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin to be held at Wausau, Wis., and for other purposes;

S. 1336. An act to amend paragraph (f) of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1342. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Board of County Commissioners of Itasca County, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the road between the villages of Cohasset and Deer River, Minn.;

S. 1348. An act for the relief of James Darcy;

S. 1519. An act permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia;

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Federal Communications Commission to investigate and report on the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and on all other companies engaged directly or indirectly in telephone communication in interstate commerce, including all companies related to any of these companies through a holding-company structure or otherwise; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution authorizing the use of public parks, reservations, and other public spaces in the District of Columbia, and the use of tents, cots, hospital appliances, flags, and other decorations, property of the United States, by Washington (D. C.) 1935 Shrine Committee, Inc., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 932) entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to extend certain air-mail contracts for a further period not exceeding 6 months."

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE CITIZEN

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Division of Investigation of the Department of Justice, before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in New York on February 7.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman with what subject the speech deals?

Mr. CONNERY. Law enforcement and the citizen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

I am here today to talk of matters vital to the peace and happiness of the law-abiding citizen. It is true that part of my discourse will concern the vast fingerprinting and identification activities of the Division of Investigation of the Department of Justice. However, in order to approach this subject, it is necessary to tell of the tremendous maze of criminal activities which are tangled with the fabric of our social order.

We look upon great industrial enterprises as big business. The biggest business in the United States is that of stealing, robbing, thieving, kidnaping, and murdering. The figures which have been compiled showing \$15,000,000,000 as the cost of the criminal industry each year are not fanciful ones. They are absurd minimums based upon the belief that every criminal costs no more than \$1,000 a year. When you look upon the records of such cases as the Urschel kidnaping, in which "Machine Gun" Kelly was chased 20,000 miles before he was captured; when you see the trial of Frank Nash, whose activities, with those of his associates, meant a trail of destruction, murder, kidnaping, suicide, and gangster killings, plus, of course, the countless banks which were robbed, you will find a cost running well into the millions, if pursuit, incarceration of prisoners, capture of hangers-on, and other items are to be considered. I could go on endlessly with examples of this type. It is only necessary, I believe, to you as intelligent citizens, to understand that it would be mere repetition.

This all sums up into one conclusion. This is your expense. This is the bill you must pay. The fate of robbery, kidnaping, or murder can come to any of you. Thus, there is no way of estimating the cost either in money or in sorrow. There is no means of determining or estimating the loss of happiness. There is no way of learning the mental agony of those who must protect themselves against the activities of gangs; against the shadow of the kidnapers which constantly creeps across the household of thousands upon thousands of American citizens. All these are items of expense which must be paid out of the hearts, the pocket-books, and the minds of the good American people.

There is something which is even more deadly, even more insidious, even more viciously criminal than the activities of such persons as I have mentioned. It is the power, the influence, and the constant interference with the course of justice pursued by those persons who make crime possible—the criminally minded attorney and the criminally minded politician.

We have allowed to be built up in this country a system which runs from the cheap office-holding panderer and the vote-getting activities of a local ward heeler in a small country town to the controlling influence of vast cities where that power is a greater one in many instances than the power of the courts in which we impose our trust and faith. It is greater than that of many police forces. It is more powerful than prosecuting attorneys. It is a dishonest power which unless checked threatens to become greater than the honesty of our American citizenry. This is the influence which politics plays in the hampering, the hamstringing, and the garroting of the honest officer who would reach out and drag the criminal from his lair.

You may say that these are general terms. That is true. They are general terms, because this activity is a general activity. It is something which permeates the fabric of our daily life. A person who has no pull, no drag, no "in" as they call it, who is not wired in to the places of power, must stand craven and trembling and take his punishment. But the stronger and more influential a man is through his political affiliations, the greater crimes he can commit and laugh at the law. It is interesting to watch the progress of the politically protected criminal. I have in mind case after case where young men have started in reformatories and been released from them, gone to sentences in other reformatories or penitentiaries, and then suddenly became, on their release, persons of influence in their communities. They control districts. They deliver votes, and after this is done, you see a sudden change in the treatment accorded them by law-enforcement agencies.

You find arrest after arrest by honest police officers and you find acquittal after acquittal where cases have been dismissed or nolle-prossed or the indictment quashed. Who does this? The police who arrest this man? The officers who have risked their lives to take into custody some vicious criminal, who perhaps is carrying a gun and has a permit to do so, given him through political affiliations? Or is it some power which is greater than that of other law-enforcement agencies? I give you this to think over and, I hope, to act upon.

It is a habit of politicians to start the insinuation that because a city or a community has an excess of criminality, there must be something wrong with the police. This is a red herring drawn across the trail to lead good citizens astray. The hardest job that a law-enforcement officer faces is not that of chasing the criminal, but of keeping his job in the face of a tremendous political barrage of influence and propaganda. If some slight thing goes wrong in a police department, there is always someone, and often with an ulterior motive, to demand an investigation, thus throwing the police department into a perfect turmoil of explanations in an effort to survive.

After all, law-enforcement officers are human beings. They have their homes. They have loved ones. They have their debts. They have the burdens and the tribulations which beset any of us in the usual course of life. Therefore, like the human being, they must think of their job; they must fight and defend it; and when a law-enforcement officer must spend the greater part of his time defending himself from ulterior influences instead of

chasing criminals, then a situation is created which is dangerous to our country's peace, its security, and happiness.

It has been my good fortune to be placed in a position where the entanglements of politics are barred from the pursuit of the criminal. When in 1924 the Division of Investigation was formed under Justice Harlan F. Stone, then the Attorney General of the United States, one of the pillars supporting its structure was that there should be no interference from any and all political forces. This has been adhered to strictly, and under the Honorable Homer Cummings, present Attorney General of the United States, leader in the present determined drive against American crime, the policy of hands off has been pursued to the highest possible point.

It is the belief of the Department of Justice that there should be some organization to point a way out of the morass of crime which has in the past bogged down our country, menacing its safety and security, and impeding its material progress. This job has been given to the Division of Investigation headed by myself under the direction of the Attorney General, and through his fearless attitude in the promulgation of new laws, a relentless, sustained, and determined movement has been begun. The word "campaign" to describe this movement is an inadequate one, because it indicates a duration of time. There shall be no end to this crusade until the criminal element as concerns Federal crimes, has been made to know the power, the majesty, and the never-ending vigilance of the Government's ability to outlaw and punish offenses against its statutes.

May I direct your attention to the results of such cases as the Urschel kidnaping, in which 16 persons already have been sentenced to prison and fully half a score more await trial? Let us take the Dillinger case. This man was the flag bearer for the underworld. He had protection in more ways than one. He had friends, criminals though they were, and he possessed stolen machine guns sold to him by persons who had bought them under the guise of legitimate purchases. John Dillinger is dead, sent to his grave by the bullets of the Division of Investigation. His chief lieutenants are dead. There is not today one living major member of the Dillinger gang. More than 40 persons who harbored and aided and abetted him have been sentenced to the penitentiary or are awaiting trial. Special agents of the Division of Investigation are on the trail of others, and they will get them.

There is one more instance which I must mention in connection with this most reprehensible crew; it is of a man whose name, I hope, forever will stand disgraced—the cowardly slayer of Special Agent W. Carter Baum. And in contrast to this craven spirit of murder, I desire also to salute in reverent memory two sterling officers who gave their lives that American homes and American possessions might be made and kept safe. I am proud to say that in the face of death, with a cowardly killer spattering forth missiles from his machine gun, they did not falter but fired straight and got their man. "Baby Face" Nelson is dead. May the memory of him be a short one, except as it reminds us of the heroism of Inspector Samuel P. Cowley and Special Agent Herman E. Hollis, representatives of the Division of Investigation, whose sacrifice will be honored in the records of the Department of Justice.

Again, in the examples of fearless pursuit, may I cite the case of Clyde Barrow and his murderous woman, Bonnie Parker. After a trail of death and robbery extending through many States, they finally were killed in the State of Louisiana some 8 months ago. They deserved to be killed. Only a week ago, after the same painstaking inquiry by which the Division of Investigation wins 93.81 percent of all cases it takes to court, 23 persons were indicted in Texas for their share in the harboring and aiding of these outlaws. I hope it is not repetitious to say that the shrewdest, most desperate gang of outlaws within recent years, the Barker-Karpis kidnaping gang, has lost three of its members through death at the hands of special agents of the Division of Investigation.

The Barker-Karpis gang did not operate solely through its own efforts. It was necessary for them to have aid in a dozen different forms. The Division of Investigation is striking at that aid through 22 indictments returned by a Federal grand jury at St. Paul, and I can promise more. All of this has been brought about through the capability of new laws sponsored by Attorney General Cummings and enacted by the Seventy-third Congress. At last the Division of Investigation has the legal backing with which to proceed. It may amaze you to know that, until about a year ago, it was not a Federal offense to kill or assault a Division of Investigation officer. Nor was it even a Federal offense to rob a depository of United States funds as long as it was done with a machine gun or other deadly weapon; if a man merely embezzled, he could be sent to a Federal penitentiary, but if he endangered the lives of bank officers and bank customers and took their money by force, only State officers could pursue him. Those in fear of kidnaping were not sufficiently protected. Special agents did not have the power of arrest within the full meaning of the law. They did not even have the right to carry arms with which to protect themselves.

All that has now been changed. The Division of Investigation of the Department of Justice within 8 months of the date of the time of the passage of these laws became a militant law-enforcement agency. Every special agent is a crack shot with rifle, machine gun, pistol, shotgun, and tear-gas weapon. But because he knows how to use all these implements of legitimate warfare is no reason to believe that the Division of Investigation is an organization of killers running wild and shooting at random. In all instances we make every effort to bring about a peaceable arrest. As an example of that, residents of New York need only recall the arrest of one of the most desperate gangs known within recent years, the notorious tri-State gang, which included two men who

had escaped from the death cell while awaiting execution, who were captured recently in New York City without the firing of a shot. However, I take this occasion to serve notice upon the criminal underworld that any resistance of arrest with recourse to firearms will be met with the high courage and coolness of intelligent officers who can face death and shoot straight.

May I say a word about these special agents? More than 83 percent of them are college graduates or certified public accountants. They have been trained diligently over a long course in all forms of scientific deduction, detection, and apprehension. They are masters of interrogation. They are experts in persistence and they are specialists in the belief that once upon the trail of an offender against Federal laws they must never cease until their man is captured and proved innocent or guilty. In this connection it would perhaps be desirable for me to compare the Division of Investigation with the far-famed Scotland Yard of London.

Such remarks as I may make must not be taken as derogatory to this fine old police organization. We have heard many times that a much desired object would be to transfer Scotland Yard to the United States. With all necessary obeisance to that great organization, I must say that we have something better than Scotland Yard in our own Division of Investigation. Our men are more highly educated. They are more highly trained. They are experts in trailing men and women of criminality from one end of the possessions of the United States to the other. Scotland Yard, when all is said and done, is merely the municipal police force of the city of London, with an area of 700 square miles. It has 19,769 officers. The Division of Investigation has a maximum of 598 field officers, less than one-thirtieth the force of Scotland Yard. Within the last year more desperate criminals have been caught, convicted, or killed while resisting arrest than in an entire decade of Scotland Yard's history, and this over a combined area of more than 3,000,000 square miles.

It is true that Scotland Yard gave to law-enforcement agencies the Henry system, by which fingerprinting became a tremendous force in the apprehension of criminals. Today Scotland Yard has 500,000 fingerprints in its criminal files. The Division of Investigation has 4,800,000 sets of fingerprints in its files, while every day there rolls in an additional 2,800, meaning that at least six times every minute during the working hours the fingerprint card of some arrested man goes into the permanent files, from which it never can escape. This is the biggest repository of criminal information in the world. Through its facilities of more than 7,300 contributing agencies it acts as a constant protector for the American people. Day by day the old alibi of mistaken identity is ending. It no longer assists the criminal to say that his name is John Jones, while the wanted man is known as "Henry Smith", because when the 10 prints of his fingers go into the identification unit of the Division of Investigation the infallible record is there in the marks of his digits which say that this is the wanted man, and there is no possible manner in which the identity can be denied. Upon many of these cards as they rest in the fingerprint files are pink slips with heavy black print which denotes that these men are wanted at some part of the country for anything from mere thievery to murder. Thirteen times or more every day, 365 times a month, and for the last fiscal year 4,356 times these cards were matched with the newly arrived prints from some law-enforcement agency perhaps 3,000 miles from the place of the crime, thus enabling fugitives to be apprehended and punished when otherwise they might have escaped.

However, the item which I am sure will interest all of you is the power which the science of fingerprinting possesses in civil life and about which, in particular, I have been asked to speak this afternoon. The entire purpose of fingerprinting is the protection of the honest citizen. It will be recalled that several years ago there were numerous mail robberies occurring in the post office at New York. During the investigation which followed 460 persons in the Registry Division were fingerprinted in an effort to afford leads helpful in the solution of the robberies. Of the persons fingerprinted 49, or more than 10 percent, were found to have previous criminal records. Of these 49, 7 admitted that they had obtained their positions in order to rob the mails.

There is no reason, to my mind, why every person who is an applicant for a position of public trust should not be willing to be fingerprinted. There are today vast numbers of public workers in cities, States, and counties about whom little is known. It should be compulsory that their fingerprints be taken before they be employed as servants of the people. To such a course there no doubt would be many objections. That is all the more reason it should be done. One crook can raise more noise against progress than a hundred honest men can make for it. Let me cite some figures.

About 6 years ago the United States Civil Service Commission began routing its fingerprints through the identification unit. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, 1 person in every 13 was found to have a criminal record. The next year 1 in 14 was discovered to be a criminal, and these, as well as those of the previous years, had run the entire range of crime from disorderly conduct to bigamy, counterfeiting, arson, burglary, and murder.

After the publicity given to these searches, the word passed to some extent through the underworld that it was unsafe for persons with criminal records to take a civil-service examination. Thereupon, the ratio dropped to 1 out of every 22. It now has fallen to the extent where only 1 person out of every 42 who applies for a civil-service job has a criminal record. The same routing out of criminal elements in public office could be promised for the various States if fingerprints of applicants could be routed through this unit.

The lawless element seems especially desirous of getting into positions of trust. In July 1929 the fingerprints of 81 applicants for positions in the Los Angeles, Calif., police department were searched and 7 were revealed as having previous records, including 1 manslaughter case, 1 hold-up and 1 grand theft.

Less than 3 years ago the police department at Mount Vernon, N. Y., referred the fingerprint cards of 299 applicants to the division. Seven of these were found to have criminal records. During December of 1933, 280 prints were received in the identification unit from the police department of Miami Beach, Fla., in the cases of persons who had applied for positions at the various resort hotels and establishments. Eighteen of these individuals had previous records; they included the passing of bad checks, contributing to the delinquency of a minor, breaking and entering, and assault to kill.

Thus, the work goes on endlessly, protecting a winter resort from persons of bad reputation, keeping a police force clean, establishing the past of a criminal who seeks to plead a previously unsullied record—these fingerprints are silent policemen, on guard 24 hours of the day. What they do to strike fear into the heart of a criminal they also can do to give peace of mind to the honest citizen.

A fingerprint is nothing more nor less than a signature which cannot be forged. When the stigma which criminal work has attached to the science has been removed, its potential uses in commercial, civil, and private life are enormous. If every important document bore the fingerprint of its signer there would be no long, expensive civil suits with forgery as the basis; the fingerprint would be there as an unchangeable seal to mark the authenticity of the document. It can be used in all matters which may be contested, and it should be used. It is my personal opinion that the time will come when every honest man will be glad to have his fingerprints on file in the noncriminal or citizens' section of the identification unit in Washington.

This civil section is becoming a matter of importance. Only a week ago a request was received from a large corporation dealing in explosives asking for 1,400 fingerprint cards, so that the prints of every employee might be placed on file in case of some catastrophe in which identification might be difficult. The fingerprints of hundreds of school children are being placed in this civil identification file for their protection. At intervals we read of train wrecks, casualties at sea, and other disasters where the list of known dead is followed by an even longer enumeration of the unidentified. Again were the fingerprints of these persons on file there would not be the long, horrible days of waiting on the part of relatives while the body of their loved one lay on a morgue slab unidentified. In hundreds of murder cases every year it is necessary to use fallible means of identification because the infallible one has not been provided.

The threat of kidnapping hangs over many families. The fingerprints of those who fear abduction should be on file in Washington. Wherever persons fear accident or death, or even illness which may strike away from home, their guardians should rest in the identification unit in Washington the fingerprints which can almost immediately establish identification. Persons of prominence suffer constantly through the activities of impersonators, who often run up bills, pass bad checks, and create difficulties. It is sometimes difficult for the real person to establish his true identity against that of the impersonator. But it could be done easily if fingerprints were on file. Thus the possibilities for use in civil, business, and private life extend endlessly. And there is even a more important angle—that of safety after death.

To illustrate, I first must cite a criminal case. Eleven years ago—August 21, 1924, to be exact—a murder was committed in Roanoke, Va. An individual known as "Andrew Hansbrough" was reported to be wanted for this crime, and a copy of the wanted circular, containing fingerprints, went forward to the identification unit to be filed for later reference. There it remained for 9 years.

On December 7, 1933, the police department at Columbia, Mo., was called to investigate a murder. A dead man had been found in an abandoned house in the southern part of Boone County, Mo. There was no evidence pointing to the slayer, nor was there anything by which the police could gain a clue as to the identity of the murdered man.

Some time passed between the time of the murder and that of finding of the slain man. By the time the police reached this out-of-the-way abandoned shack nearly 6 days had elapsed since the killing. Yet the lines and ridges and other marks which form the fingerprints of a human being are so tenacious that even at this late date it was possible to gain a set of impressions. These were taken and forwarded to the Division of Investigation. With their arrival the 9-year-old search for Hansbrough, wanted for the Roanoke murder, was ended. These fingerprints of a dead man, forwarded from Columbia, Mo., corresponded exactly.

It is to be assumed, of course, that Hansbrough had relatives and persons who cared sufficiently about him to send for his body and to see that he received burial. Even if this were not the fact in this particular case, the opportunity was provided, the man's identity was learned, the mystery of his disappearance cleared up, and a manner provided in which relatives or other interested persons could procure his body, knowing it to be the one they sought.

Now, let us change this into a hypothetical case, and one which, in some form or another, happens all too often. We will suppose, for instance, that Hansbrough, instead of being a murderer, was a highly beloved man. We will say that he had been a professor,

kindly, thoughtful; a person who had guided countless young men and women from adolescence into manhood and womanhood. Thousands of persons in all parts of the country loved him—any of them would have been willing and eager to come to his aid in time of trouble.

We will say that excessive study and mental effort had caused an attack of amnesia and the kindly old man had wandered away, to be lost to his searchers. Years passed. The thousands of dollars which had been spent upon the search for him had been in vain. At last, ill, weakened, still stricken with the malady which had destroyed his memory, he was found and taken to some public institution. The officials there strove to learn his identity and failed. In a final effort before he died, they took his fingerprints and forwarded them to Washington. Back came the answer, "No record."

The criminal, because he was a criminal, had a record of identity on file in Washington. But the kindly professor had none; penniless, he was buried in the potter's field—because he was an honest man.

If that sort of thing means anything to you, it is only necessary to write the Division of Investigation, and a specially prepared, non-criminal, fingerprint card, plus necessary instructions, will be forwarded. The same facilities are available for all the angles of fingerprinting which I have outlined, whether for cities and States for the protection of their personnel, or for the private citizen wishing to guard himself against accident, abduction, or amnesia.

This is a service of the people and for the people. It is compulsory in only one aspect; the criminal must give his fingerprints; the honest citizen has the right to choose. There is no connection between the two—the Department of Justice holds fine distinctions between the honest persons it wants to protect and the dishonest ones it seeks to run down and properly punish.

So now we come to a summation of the citizen's place in this determination to end the defiance of the criminal world. I have said before that the Department of Justice feels its duty to be that of pointing the way. Once this way has been pointed, the only method by which crime can be eradicated is by the absolute cooperation of every law-enforcement officer plus the power of every good citizen in America. Law enforcement can only be as good in a community as the desire of that community's population demands that it be good. It is a matter which demands constant vigilance. It demands that the police be freed from the political fetters which hamper them.

It demands that when enforcement becomes lax, committees of forward-looking citizens be formed at once to learn why this laxity has been allowed to develop. It is foolish to say that a police department is failing to do its work—a law-enforcement agency only fails when there is some excellent reason for it. It stands to reason that men who must risk their lives to apprehend dangerous, murderous criminals are not going to fall when that failure means danger to themselves. Therefore, it is a citizen's duty to look behind these matters. It is the citizen's duty to see that criminal attorneys or "lawyers criminal", as the Attorney General calls them, are forced out of their alliances with the underworld and are properly punished. It is the citizen's duty to see to it that the prisoner is not coddled nor allowed to be freed through easy and sometimes, I regret to say, financially reachable persons with powers of clemency.

Parole today is becoming one of the major menaces of America. Through its misapplication, convicts are being freed with little or no supervision, and often with no sound reason for release. The records of certain States in this matter are a disgrace to America. To my mind, there can only be one reason why thousands upon thousands of men who have repeatedly committed crimes are set free to commit other and often more dangerous offenses against the law. This is the failure of public officials to faithfully carry out their public trust, placing paramount the welfare and interests of society.

It is your duty to see that something is done about this. It is your duty also to see that laws, apparently innocent upon the surface, are not passed which give the criminal an advantage over the honest citizen in the trial of his case. Certainly, there should be justice, and unfailing justice, for anyone who is brought face to face with a criminal charge. But, certainly also, the prosecution of an offender should not be reduced to an absurd travesty in which justice does not depend upon the facts of the case but upon the antics, the tricks, the unscrupulous methods of crooked attorneys, and the loopholes provided by loosely framed laws which permit the criminal element to laugh at our statutes.

A great part of the tremendous crime problem which exists today is due to the fact that otherwise upright persons condoned certain acts during recent years and allowed a condition of laxity to spread until it has infiltrated every portion of our Commonwealth. So I say to you now that the Division of Investigation hopes that it can point the way by the giving of its scientific training, of its tremendous crime laboratory, of its great fingerprint system, built up through years of arduous effort, and, plus all this, the courage and nobility of highly educated hard-working men whose offering in this cause includes even that of their lives. The Department of Justice hopes to enlist the interest and the active support of the American people in their respective communities in a sustained national movement to deal with the criminal menace. But a beacon light cannot shine in a fog. May you, as persons of standing, of reputation, of high-minded citizenship, assist us to clear this murky atmosphere and bring to the American people the peace, the freedom, and security to which they are so justly entitled.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there are several special orders already for today.

Mr. MORITZ. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes immediately after the disposition of the special orders.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object provided there is no other business to come before the House this afternoon. Perhaps it would be well to have the majority leader tell us whether there have been plans made for special business today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. As I understand, there are two bills that are coming up, and if we have time, we expect to start on the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNELL. It is expected that the Private Calendar will be taken up this afternoon?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; later in the afternoon. We have an hour and a half or 2 hours of speeches, then a couple of bills under special rules.

Mr. SNELL. What bills are to come up this afternoon?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. One of them is in reference to the San Diego exposition.

Mr. BLOOM. There is another rule, but it will not take much time.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I dislike to object, but there are rules for two bills to come up for consideration today. We are very anxious to get these bills disposed of. They have been pending for several days, and I understand it will not take long to dispose of them. If the gentleman will make his request after these two measures have been disposed of, I shall not object.

Mr. MORITZ. All right. I will modify my request to meet the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. BLOOM. The request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that he be permitted to speak for 10 minutes immediately after the disposition of the special orders on the Speaker's table?

Mr. MORITZ. That is right.

Mr. SNELL. That will be before these bills to which the gentleman from Tennessee refers.

Mr. BLOOM. No. This is a special rule.

Mr. SNELL. It is not on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the rules are not on the Speaker's table.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consented to wait until after these bills have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania amend his request in that respect?

Mr. MORITZ. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that he may have permission to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the special orders for today and disposition of the two measures referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, at the conclusion of which I shall submit a unanimous-consent request which I think is very urgent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization have reported unanimously H. R. 3472, to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874), and House Joint Resolution 71, to provide for the return to the Philippine Islands of unemployed Filipinos resident in the continental United States or the Territories thereof, to authorize appropriations to accomplish that result, and for other purposes.

Both of these bills attempt to repatriate Filipinos in the United States to go back to the Philippine Islands. I believe they want to stay there provided we give them some

method of getting over there. The bill (H. R. 3472), will repatriate 100,000 or more of these aliens who are stranded in the United States and who have indicated a desire to return to their native land.

Most of these cases we find are on the relief rolls today, and by advancing their transportation expense, which will be about 1½ months' relief which they would otherwise get from the relief rolls in the larger cities, we will dispose of thousands of these people who have indicated a desire to voluntarily depart to their native land. If you want to relieve the relief rolls in various communities you may do so by passing these constructive measures. This is a very urgent matter and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to have the two bills considered at the earliest possible time next week.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SHORT. How soon do these aliens intend to return to the United States?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They cannot return, once they leave.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman stated that the transportation cost was equivalent to 1½ months' relief?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Or 2 months' relief.

Mr. BOILEAU. Why do not the various municipalities and cities that have this problem send them back without the necessity of the United States doing it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The States and municipalities did not bring them in here. They came in here under the immigration law.

Mr. BOILEAU. It would seem to me to be good business on the part of the various municipalities to get them off their hands.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It would also be better business for the United States Government to enact laws that would permit these people, including about 30,000 Filipinos and perhaps over 100,000 aliens who are on the relief roll and are stranded today, to be removed to their own country. They have indicated to the various group directors within the different areas of the cities that if they had means of transportation they would be willing to return to their native land.

Mr. SHORT. And stay there?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And stay there.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There are estimated to be 20,000,000 aliens in the United States today and that 10,000,000 of them are here unlawfully. The gentleman has had before his committee for several years a bill to stop all immigration to this country, and it ought to be stopped, and that bill ought to be reported and passed. This method of paying Filipinos, way back home is a bad precedent to be established, and such a measure ought not to pass this House, for as many others will come in their places.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the gentleman's question very accurately and thoroughly.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In answer to the gentleman, I wish the gentleman, in all fairness to the House and to himself and to me, would stop asking me a lot of nonsensical questions.

Mr. BLANTON. It is nonsensical to have 10,000,000 aliens unlawfully in the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Wait a minute. Give me a chance to answer the question. I want to be fair with the gentleman and give him information. If he does not want the information, all right.

Mr. BLANTON. I have asked no questions and have asked for no information. I think I have about as much

information on the subject as the gentleman has. I have been studying it just about as long as he has.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman want an answer to his question?

Mr. BLANTON. I shall vote for any bill the gentleman will bring in here to stop immigration from coming into this country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Here are two bills by which we can relieve the country very materially with respect to the relief rolls of the various communities of the United States and they will remove to their native land hundreds and, perhaps, thousands of aliens who will go back to their own countries and stay there.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I have studied this question as long as my friend from Texas and I wish to say to him—

Mr. BLANTON. You have been studying it for 50 years then. That is the length of time I have been studying it.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I have studied it that long.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do not take this out of my time, because I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SABATH. I should like to answer the gentleman by stating that he is absolutely erroneous in his statement that we have 20,000,000 aliens illegally in the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has made a mistake of just 10,000,000 as to what I said. I said we had 20,000,000 aliens in the United States, and 10,000,000 were here unlawfully. We are going to attend to one of them, who got in here unlawfully, before long, a certain Mr. Bruno Hauptmann, by sending him to the electric chair. But there are hundreds of others just like him here in the United States, who ought not to have ever gotten across our borders.

Mr. SABATH. I am with the gentleman in desiring to send all of them who are criminals back where they belong.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the two measures, H. R. 3472 and House Joint Resolution 71—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want just 1 minute to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not object to 1 minute.

Mr. MOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas asked a question which was a very pertinent one. It appears he did not want an answer to it, but I think the Speaker is in position to give an answer and I hope he will do so for the benefit of the rest of the Members.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If I could be given the time, I should be pleased to answer any question you might propound to me that I would know about.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman will discuss that question, we shall all be very glad to hear him.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I should like to dispose of this important question, and then at some time in the very near future I shall be pleased to discuss that.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object to the gentleman proceeding, but I shall object to the subsequent unanimous-consent request which he has in mind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from New York proceeding for 1 additional minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 3472 and House Joint Resolution 71, each providing an economical plan for the permanent removal from public and private relief rolls in the United States of certain unemployed and distressed persons who are aliens, may both be called up some day in the near future and given preferred status for consideration by the House.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to revise and extend my remarks on these two measures, I wish to explain briefly

to the House why I think passage of both of them immediately would be beneficial to this country.

House Joint Resolution 71 relates to Filipinos who are stranded in the United States and Territories. Citizens of the Philippine Islands are nationals of the United States, but Congress has not invested them with United States citizenship. Prior to the act of March 24, 1934, the Filipinos, although not citizens, were free to enter and reside in continental United States or any Territories of the United States to the same extent as citizens. The Filipino owes allegiance to the United States, but the immigration laws, which place restrictions on the admission of aliens, have no application to nationals who are not aliens. Up until the act of March 24, 1934, no effort was made to place any restriction on the movement of Filipinos.

As a consequence, therefore, many Filipinos proceeded to Hawaii and to continental United States, entering as passengers on vessels, as seamen, or possibly in other ways. Many of them who came were encouraged to come by advertisements emblazoned through the islands, and they came hoping to better their condition. Since they were not subject to inspection or examination and could enter without restriction, it is not surprising that many of them were incapable of being self-supporting, particularly so during unfavorable economic conditions here. It has been a natural result that a great many of these Filipinos have required, and are in need of, charitable assistance, either from public or private sources.

There certainly is less likelihood of these distressed Filipinos becoming restored to self-support here now than there would be if we could return them to their native surroundings. This House joint resolution proposes to afford legislative authority for sending them back to their homeland.

Any Filipino who wants to take advantage of this privilege will be required to make a voluntary application to the Secretary of Labor. It is not a compulsory law, but the acceptance of the benefits would carry certain penalties due to provisions of current law.

If any Filipino is removed to the Philippine Islands under this resolution, it would then be necessary to hold that his residence in the United States had been terminated and therefore, under the provisions of the act of March 24, 1934, he could reenter only under the same conditions applicable to all citizens of the Philippine Islands, that is, if coming for permanent residence he would have to secure and present an immigration visa and would be charged to the annual quota of 50 allotted to the Philippine Islands. He would then be in the same class as any other alien seeking admission, with one exception—he is not barred from entry because of the fact that he is ineligible to citizenship.

However, the two Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands, while appearing before our committee during public hearing on this resolution, stated quite emphatically that it was their opinion that none of the Filipinos who may be transported back to the islands under this resolution would seek to come back here, because most of them had come to the United States as adventurers, hoping to find good jobs and, having failed to do so and having fallen into distress here, they would be only too glad to get back home and would stay there.

The 1930 census of the United States indicated there were about 45,000 Filipinos in continental United States. During previous hearings on this bill witnesses estimated that about 20,000 to 30,000 Filipinos might apply for permission to return to the Philippine Islands if this resolution is enacted into law.

The movement of so many unemployed Filipinos from the public and private charity and relief rolls in the various communities of the United States would, without any doubt, be a distinct benefit to these communities and would prove helpful to many of our own citizens who also are without regular employment and who are seeking employment and who are now being supported by public relief.

The cost involved under this resolution is a mere trifle when compared to the need for continuous payment of

financial aid while these poor Filipinos are being supported here during their unemployment. The total cost for transportation would be somewhere between \$30, if on Navy transports, to \$95, if on commercial steamships, per head.

This House joint resolution has been unanimously reported to the House, with a recommendation that it pass, in the Seventy-second Congress, the Seventy-third Congress, and now in the Seventy-fourth Congress.

Under this present resolution, Filipinos must apply for its benefits before December 1, 1935, and none of the benefits are extended beyond December 31, 1935, except in cases when actual voyage has been initiated before the latter date, in which case the trip is to be completed to the Philippine Islands.

In order that final legislative action be completed early, I hope the House will have an opportunity to consider and pass it during the current month.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other of these two measures in H. R. 3472, this bill is a companion measure to H. J. Res. 71, since the purpose is identical. Provision is made to return distressed aliens to their native country regardless of how long they may have been in the United States if they want to go back but cannot do so because of lack of funds to pay their passage.

A part of section 23 of the Immigration Act of 1917 now provides for the payment of passage, from the United States to former residences abroad, to aliens who have fallen in distress within 3 years after entry and who desire to go back home.

This bill simply removes from existing law the limitation of 3 years within which the alien may fall into distress and secure the privilege of removal, at Government expense, from the United States back to his homeland.

During the 3 years immediately preceding current date there has been practically no immigration from abroad, and every alien who did come has been under the necessity to establish as a fact that, if admitted to the United States, he or she would not be a person likely to become a public charge, even if employment should be unobtainable over an extended period of time after admission. The practical effect has been that the portion of section 23, which is amended by this bill, is of no value to the Government or to the several communities where distressed aliens are found to live.

During the period of economic depression it has been found that many aliens in the United States have fallen into distress and have been maintained by public or private charity and have greatly desired to return to the country of their former residence. A considerable number of these have been in the United States for a longer period than 3 years, and so the existing provisions of law afforded no opportunity to effect their removal. Under adverse condition it is frequently the case that aliens resident within the country could better provide for themselves if living in their native country; and many seek an opportunity to return there, but they cannot provide their own passage money.

This bill permits them to apply for removal at Government expense and affords an opportunity for the Secretary of Labor to contract for their passage abroad at economical figures and by doing so relieve the overburdened taxpayers of this country of the continued support of these aliens who are now on public and private relief rolls and on work-relief rolls to the detriment of our own citizens who also need all the relief the Government can afford to extend to them.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization feels that this bill, and also House Joint Resolution 71, are both economically and socially desirable at the present time and would be of tremendous benefit to everybody concerned, as well as to the several cities, towns, and communities where these unemployed and distressed aliens are now the subjects of private and public charity.

For the information of the House I will say that just this month, when our committee held public hearings on these two measures, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization appeared before the committee and stated the views of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of Labor.

With regard to H. R. 3472, Hon. Daniel W. MacCormack, the Commissioner, said, "We heartily endorse the bill."

With regard to House Joint Resolution 71, he stated: "We are heartily in favor of the proposed legislation."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to renew my request for unanimous consent that H. R. 3472 and House Joint Resolution 71 may both be called up some day in the near future and given a preferred status for consideration by this House. I thank you.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the gentleman from New York would set a bad precedent; and would, in fact, accomplish nothing in reducing the number of aliens in this country, hence I am going to be forced to object to his request.

Paying the expenses of returning to their homes of these approximately 30,000 Filipinos would be a futile waste of public money. More than the number returned would immediately find their way here, and come across our borders regardless of laws and regulations.

I am reliably informed that large fishing vessels are now equipped, maintained, and operated to effect regular exchanges at sea; and it would, in my judgment, be ridiculous for us to return them home free of charge whenever they happen to get homesick.

I am reliably informed that if we could deport all of the aliens now in this country there would be a job for every American, and there would be no more suffering and shivering and hunger in our big cities, and there would be no need of our Government's granting relief or appropriating \$4,800,000,000 to start public works.

American jobs in the United States should be and must be preserved for Americans, and we in this Congress must take decisive steps to redistribute these jobs, and take them away from foreigners and give them back to Americans.

No American has any chance whatever to get a job in any foreign country. Just try to find employment in one of them. When they learn that you are an American, you are given to understand that their jobs are for their own nationals.

As soon as the Seventy-third Congress met 2 years ago, I introduced a bill to stop all immigration for 10 years, so as to give us time to assimilate our foreign-born naturalized citizens here before we allowed any more to come, and so that we could preserve American jobs for Americans.

The bill went to the committee of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is chairman; and after I finally succeeded in getting hearings on it, the committee took a vote, and it was the vote of the chairman [Mr. DICKSTEIN] that kept the bill from being reported. If he had not cast his vote against reporting the bill, it would have been reported and passed by Congress. For I firmly believe that whenever this House gets an opportunity to vote on such a bill, it will pass it by a tremendous majority, for I believe that a large majority of the Members of Congress, both House and Senate, are in favor of stopping all immigration for 10 years, and preserving American jobs for Americans.

Is it not silly and nonsensical to have 12,000,000 Americans out of jobs, and cannot get jobs, and at the same time to have 20,000,000 aliens in the United States, and allow more of them each year to continue coming here, when Americans are in distress, and the Government is feeding and housing and supporting millions of them.

Regardless of claims continually made to the contrary, but made by persons not in favor of stopping immigration, I have reliable information and statistics to show that there are now over 20,000,000 aliens in the United States, and that of these 20,000,000, there are at least 10,000,000 of these aliens who are here unlawfully, just as Bruno Hauptmann came here unlawfully, and stayed here unlawfully, and was here unlawfully when he committed the foulest and most dastardly crime ever known to civilization, and just as this infamous Bruno Hauptmann has continued to stay here unlawfully all during these expensive weeks of trial that has cost over \$600,000. There are thousands of aliens just like Bruno Hauptmann here in the United States now, unlawfully, and we must pass legislation to make them all register,

and find means of detecting them, and provide for their deportation.

On the first day of this present session of Congress I again introduced a bill to stop all immigration to the United States for 10 years. It went to the committee of which my friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is chairman. Why does he not report that bill? Why does he not pass that bill? The Americans in the United States want it passed. The American Federation of Labor wants it passed. The Daughters of the American Revolution want it passed. The American Legion wants it passed. The Veterans of Foreign Wars want it passed. And a big majority of the Members of this Congress want it passed. Then why is it not reported and passed? It is because the chairman of that committee is not in favor of it. It is because the chairman of that committee does not want to report it. It is because the chairman of that committee does not want to pass this bill.

If my friend from New York were in favor of that bill, he could find means of reporting it this week. He could find means of having it promptly considered. He could pass it here in this House. If he wants to do something constructive and worth while, he should pass this bill to stop all immigration for 10 years, and should pass legislation to register and deport all aliens, and then he would make it possible for every American now out of a job to have a job that is now being filled by some alien.

I want all of my colleagues to know, and I want the people of the United States to know, that just as soon as 30 legislative days have expired since this Congress convened I am going to file on the Clerk's desk a petition to discharge the gentleman's committee from further consideration of this bill; and if we can get 217 of you colleagues to sign that petition, we will take this bill up and pass it in this Congress, and we will stop all immigration to the United States for 10 years, and we will preserve American jobs for American citizens. And then Americans will not have to be on Government charity any longer. And then American citizens would not have to be fed and housed and clothed by the Government. And then this Government will not have to tax Americans \$4,800,000,000 to provide public works through Government jobs for Americans if we will deport 10,000,000 aliens now unlawfully here from foreign countries who now hold American jobs that ought to be held by Americans.

Mr. Speaker, for the above reasons I am constrained to object to the request of the gentleman from New York.

THE GREAT EMANCIPATOR

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, including therein an address delivered by my colleague [Mr. KNUTSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an eloquent tribute to Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, delivered by my colleague the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, before the Sons of Union Veterans, at Philadelphia, on February 9, 1935.

It is to me a very great pleasure as well as a very great honor to be privileged to speak to this gathering of Sons of Union Veterans. There is an added element of pleasure in the presence of a small group of Civil War veterans, the first that I have had the honor to address for several years.

As I stand before you this evening my memory goes back to the fall of 1896 when, as a barefooted boy I stood upon the curbing of Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis, and saw that mighty host of the Grand Army of the Republic pass in review in connection with their annual encampment. Then they were in their prime, clear-eyed and elastic of step. In a few months they were to elect one of their number, the martyred McKinley, President of the United States, the last of their number to be so honored. For 30 years they had been the guiding hand in our national affairs, and in the discharge of that duty they displayed the same patriotism and loftiness of purpose that animated and immortalized them in the unselfish service they rendered their country in 1861-65. Now, alas, their ranks have thinned until there is but a pitiful remnant of that soul-inspiring line of blue that answered the call of Father Abraham at an hour when the very future of the Republic hung in the balance. May I say without appearance of unseemly adulation that those were the golden years of the Republic.

I am honored to speak to you, their descendants, this evening. Through your veins courses the blood of that gallant body of men that helped Grant gain victory at Shiloh and Donelson; who achieved immortality at Gettysburg; who marched with Sherman to the sea in a campaign as notable and brilliant as the march of Hannibal and his legions over the snow-covered passes of the Alps; and who finally saw their sacred cause triumph at Appomattox and the glorious Union firmly established. Throughout that long and painful struggle, which was to decide for all time to come whether a union of States, conceived in the cause of human liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal, should continue to endure and serve as a beacon, lighting the pathway toward freedom to the rest of the world, or whether it should go down to destruction on the rocks of dissension, thereby forging the stronger those shackles which bound three and one-half million human beings in servitude and bondage. Throughout that long and bitter struggle the mighty hosts in blue and the sacred cause for which they so freely shed their blood and laid down their lives were inspired by leadership given them by an all-wise and all-seeing Providence.

As the procession of mankind passes in review, we observe at long intervals, and only in time of some great crisis, a figure that towers high above his fellow man, who steps to the front and by common consent assumes leadership. In times gone by the human family has been served by a number of such leaders, and in the comparatively small number George Washington and Abraham Lincoln stand out as shining and illustrious lights. Each contributed his all to the country we call our own, and their places in history are so firmly established, so well known, and so generally conceded that there is little that we can say or do to add to the luster that is theirs.

As the unbelievers said of Christ, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" So there were those who undoubtedly asked of themselves and of others, "Can it be possible that a man born in a log cabin in Kentucky, rough and uncouth, without any of those qualities which we are accustomed to associate with greatness, can it be that such a man is fitted by tradition and training to occupy the greatest elective office in all the world, the Presidency of the United States?" And it was but natural that they should thus inquire of Christ and of Lincoln, for although one was born in a lowly manger in Bethlehem, the other in a log cabin, open on one side and without windows, doors, or floor, both stand out today as the two greatest individuals of all time, and their names are written in letters of burning light that the mutations of time can neither tarnish nor dim.

We have assembled this evening to commemorate the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth. We are here not as partisans but as pilgrims to worship at the shrine of the man whom God gave to the American people as their deliverer in their darkest hour of despair, and in this gathering we will renew our devotion to that great man and our loyalty to the heritage that he has left us.

Many of you have been privileged to hear from the lips of your patriotic sires the story of Abraham Lincoln. Indeed, many of your fathers undoubtedly knew Lincoln, and you, therefore, have first-hand information as to the manner of man he was. His enemies caricatured him as a monster, but those who knew him could see in his sorrow-lined features the image of the Master—and that is the Lincoln his friends knew and loved and who lives and will live for all time to come.

The rugged pioneer stock from which Lincoln sprang was nurtured amidst privation and hardship such as are today unknown. They braved the lurking dangers of the forest wilderness with that assurance and confidence that has ever characterized your real American. With their onward march they constantly pushed back the frontiers, built roads, established homes, schools, and churches, carved out farms and cities in an untamed empire that was destined to become the bread-and-butter basket of the world.

The only music that he knew as a boy and young man was the singing of birds, the murmur of brooks, and the rustle of the trees. Truly, if any man grew up in close communion with his Maker it was Abraham Lincoln, the man of sorrows whose sympathetic heart embraced all humanity. His early reading was confined to six books: The Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, A History of the United States, Aesop's Fables, Weem's Life of Washington, and Robinson Crusoe. Holland has truly said: "The poverty of Lincoln's library was the wealth of his mind." With such a foundation for learning one could hardly expect the development of a mind that has given to posterity the oration at Gettysburg and the Second Inaugural Address, two of the most polished gems in all our literature. Let me read to you another of his literary gems, his letter to Mrs. Bixby:

"DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

"Yours very sincerely and respectfully,

"ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

Early in life Lincoln was to know his first great sorrow with the passing of a wonderful mother whom he loved with all the pas-

sionate devotion of a young and trusting heart. She had been his guide and counsellor, and of her he afterward said: "All that I am or ever hope to be I owe to my angel mother."

Former Congressman Chipperfield, of Illinois, in a masterly eulogy on Lincoln, delivered before the House of Representatives several years ago, related that at the time of her interment it was impossible to give her Christian burial, and that Lincoln grieved deeply thereat and refused to be comforted. Months afterward he learned that a man of God was at a distant point, and he set out on the dangerous journey to secure this holy man to come and perform the last rites of Christian burial at her grave. It was only when this had been done that peace and comfort returned to his heart.

Later he was to know another great sorrow. The young girl to whom he had plighted his troth and given his heart, Anne Rutledge, died just as she was entering the full bloom of womanhood. Lincoln many times visited her grave and communed with her spirit.

Lincoln had the sensitive heart of an unspoiled child. He sought the love of his fellow men, and their good will and esteem encouraged and supported him. It was but natural that one with his lofty ideals, his grandeur of thought and stability of character, should early attract the attention of his neighbors. In 1832 he was proposed for a seat in the Illinois Legislature but was defeated. He was, however, elected in 1834 and served in the legislature until 1840 when he declined a nomination. In 1846 he was elected to Congress but was not a candidate for renomination 2 years later; in 1854 he was a candidate for the United States Senate but withdrew in favor of another candidate; in 1856 he aspired to the Vice Presidency but was not named by the convention. Two years later he was a candidate for the United States Senate and carried the popular vote of the State of Illinois by 4,000 although the legislature subsequently elected Mr. Douglas, but the debates that had been held between himself and Judge Douglas during that memorable campaign made him a national figure and in 1860, at the Republican National Convention in Chicago, he was nominated for the Presidency, and elected. In 1864 he was renominated and again elected.

In my humble opinion, Lincoln's election to the Presidency was providential. In the light of the stirring events that followed his elevation to the position of Chief Executive and the masterful genius displayed by him in meeting every great emergency, including intrigue and disloyalty on all sides, it becomes more and more apparent that Abraham Lincoln, and he alone, could have successfully prosecuted the great war for the preservation of the Union.

The war opened inauspiciously. The first battle resulted in the rout of the Union forces, and for more than 2 years the secessionists had the better of it. It was only when the grim and silent Grant carried the day at Shiloh and Pittsburgh Landing that the first rays of hope broke through the gloomy, war-clouded sky. Those were days that tried his soul, and his great heart was torn by the suffering and misery that grew out of that titanic struggle. Had he not possessed the love, confidence, and affection of the people of the North, and more especially of those who left their firesides to fight for the preservation of the Union, the cause could not have triumphed. To one and to all he was Father Abraham, the man whose heart encompassed all humanity, and it was to him that the down-trodden and the oppressed looked for succor and relief.

In passing upon a case of a lad condemned to death for falling asleep at his post, Lincoln said: "I could not think of going into eternity with the blood of that poor young man on my skirts. It is not to be wondered at that a boy raised on a farm, probably in the habit of going to bed at dark, should, when required to watch, fall asleep; I cannot consent to shoot him for any such act."

The impressive sequel of this act of mercy was brought to light when the dead body of this soldier boy was found on the battlefield of Fredericksburg and next to his heart a photograph of the President, across which he had written, "God bless Abraham Lincoln."

His untimely death, just as he had reached the pinnacle of usefulness and fame, was the greatest tragedy since the crucifixion, and, strange to say, by a peculiar coincidence the end came on Good Friday, the anniversary of the death of our Savior.

It was only when the great Lincoln lay cold in death that his real greatness and nobility of character were appreciated and understood. He left behind him a monument as enduring as the ages, a united country, firmly established on the eternal principles of justice, welded together in the strong bonds of fraternity, and sealed by the sacred blood of the countless thousands who died that liberty might live. Today, threescore years and ten after his death, Abraham Lincoln is yet a living, breathing inspiration to all the people of the world, and so he will continue to be in all the centuries yet to come. We—

"Talk of thy doom without a sigh;
For thou art Freedom's now, and Fame's;
One of the few, the immortal names
That were not born to die."

In these days of stress and strife it would be well if we were to take from the life of Lincoln some of the precepts with which it is so generously interspersed. Abraham Lincoln is frequently quoted by the demagogue as proponent of the dangerous panaceas that are being proposed as cures for the ills of our body politic. He is frequently quoted in support of doctrines that seek to array class against class and which ultimately would break down the very cor-

nerstone upon which the Republic is reared. Fellow citizens, we have never had a President who gave more meticulous and scrupulous consideration to the rights of all men. We have never had a Chief Magistrate who observed the Federal Constitution with greater reverence and respect. Indeed, his great love for our country and its institutions was his outstanding characteristic. Abraham Lincoln believed in constitutional government of the people, by the people, and for the people. He stood for sound money, for the protection of the American wage earner and producer, for adequate preparedness, and for an economic program that would bring the greatest good to the greatest number. He believed in the common man, and it is plainly discernible that one of his motivating reasons for opposing the institution of slavery was that he did not subscribe to the doctrine that free labor should be compelled to compete with slave, or forced, labor. At any time during the war he could very easily have set up a dictatorship under the plea of an emergency, but I am sure that the idea never once entered his honest and guileless mind, because it was foreign to his philosophy of life.

From earliest boyhood to the tragic end he believed in and fought for those principles of government that are essentially American; and so, my friends, let us not be deceived by what theorists and sophists would have us believe regarding the things that Abraham Lincoln stood for in the way of government.

An impartial study of his inspiring life furnishes convincing proof that he was sound to the core, ever devoted to the best of American ideals and traditions, holding steadfast to the Constitution, veering neither to the right nor to the left, and always adhering to a course of action dictated by a conscience responsive to a deep and abiding sense of righteousness.

Let us then, on this anniversary of the birth of the savior of the Republic, dedicate ourselves anew to the immortal principles for which he lived and died. Let us at this time, when fascism and communism are rearing their ugly heads in our midst, drink deep and often at those wellsprings of human thought and action that inspired the founders of the Republic and that stimulated the undying faith in his fellow man of Abraham Lincoln, and of those heroic souls who stood with him shoulder to shoulder during the darkest hours of the Republic and made this glorious country of ours free, one and indivisible. Their memory will ever remain one of the brightest chapters in our history. My countrymen, let us cleave to those ideals for which they fought, suffered, and died, ever keeping before us those principles of government which have made our country the brightest star in the grand galaxy of nations.

REFINANCING OF FARM MORTGAGES

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks on a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska urging the enactment of remedial legislation for refinancing farm mortgages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska urging the enactment of remedial legislation for refinancing of farm mortgages:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact remedial legislation for refinancing of farm mortgages

Whereas the farmers of the agricultural regions of the United States are financially disabled; and

Whereas many farm lands are heavily mortgaged and the farmers are hopelessly in debt and many will eventually lose their farms unless relief is given; and

Whereas the prosperity of the United States and its people is dependent upon the well-being of the farmer and his ability to purchase; and

Whereas the gateway to prosperity is the gateway leading from the golden fields of the great agricultural region of the Middle West; and

Whereas the farmer and his dependents cannot and will not spend while attempting to carry a heavy load of indebtedness; and

Whereas the prosperity of the agricultural regions of this country means the prosperity of the whole country since the purchase of any machinery and any equipment as well as clothing and food will create such a demand that factories would reopen and employ more people; and

Whereas inflation would tend to enable the debtors to get out of debt and to make the whole country more prosperous, as it has done many times before in this country and is now doing in England and other countries; and

Whereas a mild inflation has helped the United States regain its prosperity on numerous occasions and is now helping England and other countries to regain prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska in fiftieth legislative session assembled,

1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such

remedial legislation as will provide for refinancing through the Federal farm-loan banks of the whole farm-mortgage debt at an annual interest rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent and an annual amortization charge of $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the principal, with balance to be paid in not less than 10 nor more than 20 years; that the funds for this operation shall be obtained through issuance of some \$3,500,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes.

2. That a copy of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to each of the Congressmen elected in the State of Nebraska, and that our Congressmen and Senators be urged to use their best offices to prosecute the enactment of such legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

PRESENT-DAY NEED FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by my colleague [Mr. MARSHALL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. L. T. MARSHALL at the Lincoln Day banquet at Asheville, N. C., on the evening of February 11, 1935:

The subject which it is my purpose to discuss tonight is the present need for the Republican Party. I think it an appropriate subject to discuss in connection with the celebration of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Never since the inception of the party has the country had a greater need for it and for an adherence to its fundamental principles than at this particular moment. In this period of confused thought the Republican Party must be a steadying influence. We find ourselves in the position of a minority party, a role to which we have not been accustomed. We have been, for the most part, the majority party, and it has been with a little difficulty that we have accommodated ourselves to this position. We have, however, in my opinion, filled this role better than the Democratic Party has performed its function as the majority party.

We are the party of opposition, and it becomes our duty to oppose the unsound, impractical, socialistic, and communistic legislation that is being foisted on the Nation. If we compromise with, rather than oppose, this program, there remains no real legitimate reason for our continuance as a party. We cease to be that great constructive force to which the people of this Nation have so often looked for real leadership in times of crisis. It is the duty of the Republican Party to continue to stand firm for sanctity of contracts, sound money, the protective tariff, national economy, and the rights and liberties of the individual.

The Republican Party is not dead nor is it dying, and it becomes more evident each day that a return to the sound principles of our party will be necessary to restore business confidence to the end that private industry will again employ the idle workmen of this Nation. No party is dead that receives the suffrage and approval of thirteen and one-half million voters as did our party in the election last fall. The shrinkage in the Republican vote, as compared with the 1932 election, was only one-half as great as was the shrinkage in the Democratic vote.

The result of the last election does not indicate a preference for the principles of the Democratic Party. That result was occasioned by Tammanyizing a distressed people with millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I join with Senator BAILEY, of your own State, when he said just recently, "I have no respect for a public servant who will purchase public favor with public money." The result in the last election could not indicate approval of the principles of the Democratic Party because every principle set forth in its platform of 1932 has been repudiated by the administration now in power at Washington.

Do you think that if the platform of the Democratic Party in 1932 had declared in favor of the things that have been done by the administration at Washington that they could have been successful in that election? Most certainly not.

It is amusing indeed to compare the promises in their platform of 1932 with the action taken since March of 1933. Their performance has been the exact opposite of the promises made to the people.

One of the most serious problems confronting the Nation today is the unemployment problem. The number is estimated at between ten and twelve million—more than at any time in our history. Four million are in Government employment, and it is estimated the number receiving Federal aid this winter to be 20,000,000. This is the picture that confronts us after 21 months of the new deal. The time has come when we should no longer speak of the Hoover depression, but, in the words of Senator LONG, Democratic Senator from Louisiana, if he will permit us to speak any longer of him as a Democrat, we should call it the Roosevelt depression.

I want, for a few moments, to discuss this unemployment problem. In the last session of the Congress there was appropriated

\$3,300,000,000 to put people to work. We were told by the administration leaders on the floor of Congress that this would bring us out of the wilderness into the promised land. The results do not justify that prediction. There are more unemployed today than at the time this appropriation was voted. In the face, however, of the failure of the program, the lower House of Congress just the other day voted \$4,880,000,000, four billion of which, we are again told, will solve the unemployment problem. No one objects to the appropriation of the \$880,000,000 for relief, nor would we object to even a greater amount, if such is necessary, to provide for the needs of those who are unemployed without fault of their own. We do object to the four billion, for it will not bring the results, and it is my fear that next year an even larger amount may be asked.

Gen. Hugh Johnson just recently wrote on this subject. He said that when the ten million now unemployed were in gainful employment the volume of business per year in the United States was ninety billion, and that today the volume is only forty billion. This leaves a gap of fifty billion to be bridged. I will ask you how far \$4,000,000,000 will go toward bridging this gap or taking up this slack? He says that it might employ three and a half million people, but this would be temporary employment, so we would still have six or seven million unemployed with the danger that after the expenditure of this money the employment would be just as great as now. You know, I know, and everybody knows that if these unemployed people are to be reemployed it must be done by private industry.

Congress cannot enact legislation to immediately employ these people, but I state in all sincerity that Congress should refrain from passing any more laws that will hinder private industry in their reemployment. I say further that the repeal of some of these laws passed under this administration would be a great help. Much of the legislation of the last two sessions of Congress has retarded recovery in private industry. Confidence is absolutely necessary to the operation of private industry, and the legislation to which I refer, instead of creating confidence has created uncertainty and fear for the future.

I refer to the financial legislation which I do not have time here to discuss other than to say that capital will not be invested in any long-time business undertakings until there is a settled policy in regard to the financial policies of our Government. The fear of uncontrolled inflation hovers like a cloud over every board of directors' meeting in the land.

I refer also to the reciprocal-tariff legislation under which law the President has authority to reduce tariffs as much as 50 percent practically without notice or without an opportunity on the part of affected industry to be fairly heard. This legislation is a constant threat to the business activity of this Nation.

Under this legislation our Secretary of State, an ardent and enthusiastic free trader, sits down around the council table with representatives of foreign governments and there lays down a tariff policy affecting the welfare of every workingman in the United States. In the enactment of this law Congress placed the tariff-making authority in the hands of the enemies of protection.

I refer to the National Recovery Act, which must be greatly modified or repealed or permitted to die a natural death in June of 1935. You cannot improve business by putting it in a strait-jacket. Forty-one million dollars has been assessed and collected in the past year from industry to operate the offices of the various code administrators and subadministrators throughout the Nation. We have fly-swatter codes, toothpick codes, necktie codes, totaling in all about 600.

Another most serious problem is our great and ever-increasing national debt. Unfortunately the people have not taken this problem seriously enough, but they are rapidly awakening to a realization of the dangerous situation.

An individual with an income of \$100 per month, whether it be from business or wages, can spend \$300 a month so long as he can borrow. During this period he can have a fine time just so long as his credit lasts, then his condition is worse than before. He must live, pay the interest and the debt out of his \$100 per month. You might borrow \$10,000 and appear prosperous so long as it lasted. What then? The same is true of our Government.

I care not how worthy the motive of Government borrowing, when the debt reaches the point that it cannot be paid by taxation then confidence in the credit of our Government is gone. If we reach that point, and we are approaching it dangerously fast, how then shall we feed the hungry and needy? Only one way and that is the Government will be compelled to start the printing presses and turn out paper money.

It is not necessary to discuss the results to follow. History has recorded the same result wherever this program has been followed.

It has been a misconceived idea on the part of many that the Government creates wealth, whereas, in fact, the Government never created a bit of wealth and never will. It is a distributor of wealth collected from the taxpayers of this Nation. Our Government debt now is \$28,000,000,000, and five billion more just authorized by the lower House of Congress. How much further can it go? This is problematical—possibly another year or two.

The great question is, Will we have the courage to stop borrowing before it is forever too late? It does require courage when not only the jobless and dependent but the business man, who has benefited temporarily, are all urging that we do not stop now. We cannot stop completely at this moment, but we cannot solve our difficulties by continued expenditure of borrowed money. If we

do not stop, we will suffer bankruptcy or uncontrolled inflation or both. Either means complete disaster.

Another disturbing element in our economic life is the steady encroachment of Government upon the field of private enterprise. One example of this is the post exchange. The original purpose of this establishment of post exchanges was for the accommodation of the soldier or Government employee in isolated locations. We find them now located near towns and cities in direct competition with private industry in those localities. The merchant in the nearby community cannot compete with these. No wages are paid to the operator of the exchange, no insurance is carried, no taxes are paid, no depreciation to be charged off, and no balance sheet kept. Profit or loss is not essential to its operation. This particular matter may be of small consequence, but it illustrates the unfair competition where the Government enters private industry. It is not fair for the Government to compete with the citizens who support it.

In this connection I want to call attention to the Tennessee Valley Authority which is located not so far away. In connection with their flood-control program they are generating electricity and establishing factories to make use of this power in direct competition with private industry throughout the country. This project, coupled with the threat to establish similar projects throughout the land, is preventing investment of millions of dollars in betterments and extensions by private industry and thus holding up the employment of thousands upon thousands of idle men.

You cannot tax industry to secure a fund with which to compete with that industry without drying up the industry itself. If this program is continued, we shall wake up one of these days to find the only business left is that supported directly or indirectly by the Government. We are fast approaching a system of state socialism.

By authority of legislation passed under this administration the Government has formed several corporations under the laws of the State of Delaware and through these corporations may engage directly in any kind of business it may desire anywhere in the United States or its Territories.

One of these is called the Electric Home and Farm Authority, another is the Federal Subsistence and Homestead Corporation, another Public Works and Emergency Housing Corporation, another Federal Surplus Relief Corporation.

If one would take the time to read the powers and authority granted under these articles of incorporation, it would be most startling to the people of this country. One paragraph of the articles of incorporation of the Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation grants this authority—to acquire improved or unimproved real estate and all buildings thereon and appurtenances thereto by purchase, exchange, exercise of the power of eminent domain or otherwise, whether or not in connection with the construction of any public-works project; to hold, maintain, and improve such real estate, buildings and appurtenances; and, subject to the approval of the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works or other duly designated representative of the United States of America, to sell, exchange or otherwise dispose of such real estate, buildings and appurtenances or to lease the same with or without the privilege of purchase.

Under the authority granted these corporations the United States Government, with taxpayers' money, may enter into any business in which the citizens of the United States are engaged. To what extent these corporations have been used up until now I am not advised, but in connection therewith let me say that you might as well hang a man as to keep him in suspense for 30 days.

Those advocating government in business urge same on social grounds. These folks fail to distinguish between society and government. A recent article in the Saturday Evening Post quotes Tom Paine as saying:

"Some writers have so confounded society with government as to leave little or no distinction between them, whereas they are not only different but have different origins. Society is produced by our wants and government by our wickedness; the former promotes our happiness positively by uniting our affections, the latter negatively by restraining our vices. Society in every state is a blessing, but government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one; for when we suffer or are exposed to the same miseries by a government, which we might expect in a country without government, our calamity is heightened by the reflection that we furnish the means by which we suffer."

The Republican Party should oppose with all its vigor and determination any further delegation of authority to the executive department of our Government. Most of us thought that Congress had gone clear beyond the limit of safety along this line in the last two sessions of Congress; but if the four billion eight hundred million appropriation is enacted into law in the form it was forced through the lower House of Congress under the gag rule, all power, both real and imaginary, will have been conferred on the President of the United States. It will be most difficult to observe any authority that is denied him. It is my opinion that the people of the Nation are fast awakening to the danger of this action, and that the time has come when it is desirable—not only desirable but necessary—for the welfare of the country that Congress again function as the duly elected representatives of their constituents.

I am reminded of a story:

A man was walking down the street and was heard talking to himself, saying, "No! No! No!" Every few steps he would repeat the words "No! No! No!" His action was called to the attention

of an officer, who approached him and, tapping him on the shoulder, said: "What is the matter? Are you crazy?" The reply was, "No! No! No!" Upon taking the man to headquarters and having an investigation made, it was discovered that he was a Democratic "Yes man" Congressman on vacation.

If I might be permitted to advise the Democratic administration as to what they might do during the remainder of this administration in the interest of the country, I would advise them that the one and all-important thing that they might do would be to change their attitude toward business or private industry in America.

There was introduced in the Congress just last week a bill of 178 printed pages, which I have not had the opportunity to read, and which I suppose will be brought in under the gag rule within a few days and passed by the Congress, which bill, I am informed, has among its provisions one to the effect that all holding utility companies be dissolved by the year 1940. I do not, at this moment, hold any brief on behalf of any utility company that needs regulation, but I do here and now say that this kind of legislation, rushed through Congress without time to study it, is just another act on the part of this administration that will tend to further prevent recovery of business activity.

In closing, permit me to say that we should all resolve, and it should be the outstanding purpose of the Republican Party that, in the words of Lincoln, a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

WATERWAY ACROSS THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The SPEAKER. Under a special order the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein some brief statistical statements and a radio speech which I delivered on the 9th of February over station WJSV and the Columbia System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the House in extending unanimous consent to me for consideration of the subject which I am now about to discuss. I have introduced a bill (H. R. 2785) to provide for the construction of a canal across northern Florida, connecting the waters of the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. This is the subject of my talk this morning. This subject, to the American people, is by no means a new one. As far back as the administration of President Andrew Jackson a communication was sent by him to Congress recommending the construction of a waterway across the peninsula of Florida to connect the waters of the Atlantic Ocean with the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. About 1880, a half century later, the matter was revived through surveys made by General Gilmore, who was then with the Board of Army Engineers. In General Gilmore's surveys it was found that feasible routes existed for the construction of this waterway. At that time the commerce of this country and the commerce of the world had not reached a development sufficient to warrant the construction of the canal. Also, American waterway development was then in its infancy, and funds for such purposes were not then as available as they are today, and not much more was said about the project until about 10 years ago.

Four years ago physical surveys of this canal were authorized by the Congress, following preliminary surveys which were made some 6 or 7 years ago. The preliminary surveys warranted the Board of Army Engineers in making the physical surveys and the Congress in passing an item in the river and harbor bill of 1930 for physical surveys. It was my pleasure to introduce both survey bills. About \$300,000 or \$350,000 has been spent by the Federal Government in making these surveys of a waterway to connect the waters of the Atlantic Ocean with those of the Gulf of Mexico through the southern part of Georgia and/or northern portion of Florida. A large number of routes were surveyed, and this chart or map shows several of those which were considered and upon which careful detailed physical surveys were made. Among these is one leading from the entrance of the St. Marys River across the southern part of Georgia, through the Okefenokee Swamp to the Suwannee River, and, by the way, the Suwannee River is a rather large stream, and thence down the Suwannee River to the Gulf of Mexico,

coming out at the mouth of the Suwannee River. Also, surveys were made branching off in the vicinity of White Springs, Fla., from the Suwannee River, going on out southwesterly to the Gulf of Mexico in the vicinity of Deadmans Bay and also westerly to the Gulf of Mexico south of Tallahassee, Fla. Another survey began at the Atlantic Ocean just east of the city of Jacksonville, Fla., and went northerly from the city of Jacksonville, on the southern part of the Okefenokee Swamp, through what is known as the south prong of the St. Marys River, and on in the vicinity of Jasper, Fla., and near the Suwannee River and thence south and on through the routes as indicated in the south Georgia survey.

Another entered from the Atlantic Ocean by way of Jacksonville and goes on down the St. Johns River to Black Creek, on in the vicinity of Middleburg, then across the Peninsula of Florida, just north of Starke and Lawtey, Fla., and High Springs, Fla., and thence on to the Suwannee River across to Deadmans Bay, at the mouth of the Steinhatchee River, and into the Gulf of Mexico. It also carried a survey through the Suwannee River in a southwesterly direction to the mouth of the river. This proposed route or survey extends only about 70 miles from tidewater of the St. Johns River to tidewater of the Gulf of Mexico.

Also, we have had commercial surveys of this route for a steamship canal across the Peninsula of Florida. This is the shortest possible route that could be utilized. It is less than 70 miles from tidewater to tidewater. It will also incur a low strip of land in the vicinity of High Springs and from there to the Suwannee River on to the Gulf of Mexico and, in the opinion of many engineers, is the most feasible possible route across south Georgia or northern Florida from the Atlantic to the Gulf waterway.

The Board of Engineers also carried their surveys from the Atlantic Ocean by Jacksonville, Palatka, and on down the St. Johns River to the Oklawaha River.

From the Oklawaha River across a low strip of country to the Withlacoochee River and on out to the Gulf of Mexico in the vicinity of Port English, Dunnellon, and Yankeetown. This survey also carries another route from the vicinity of Ocala, Fla., in a northeasterly direction, then in a westerly and a southwesterly direction to a point between Cedar Keys and Port English and Dunnellon. That also encounters a low strip of country which is easily dredgeable and through which a canal can be constructed with a minimum degree of cost. This St. Johns-Oklawaha-Withlacoochee Rivers route via Ocala is considered very feasible.

There is another route branching off also from the St. Johns River, going across Santa Fe Lake, down the Santa Fe River on to the Suwannee River and on out to Cedar Keys, Fla. By some of the most learned engineers in America that has been approved as one of the most feasible routes for a ship canal across the northern part of Florida and the southern part of Georgia.

Now, in the construction or dredging of this canal in the eastern portion of the State of Florida and south Georgia, for that matter, we find a sandy loam soil which is very easy to dredge and which can be dredged at a very low cost. Across the main ridge we encounter mostly a sand and clay formation, and in the low strips, in the vicinity of Silver Spring, Fla., and Paynes Prairie, Fla., all of that central portion, including also the Okefenokee Swamp section and the Suwannee Valley section, we have a soft, mucky soil, which is very easily dredged.

On the western side of the State of Florida and also the central portion of south Georgia we encounter there a soft-rock formation which can be dredged and removed with our modern dredges at a very reasonable price per cubic yard. I shall be glad to put the actual cost of construction per yard in my remarks.

This canal, as a steamship canal, will carry a bottom width of about 250 feet in the contracted rock sections and will be widened out to about 400 feet in the sandy or soil sections. It will be 35 feet deep. As for its being feasible, I do not believe that any of the engineers now in the Public Works

Administration or with the Board of Army Engineers hold anything except that one or more of these routes are entirely feasible, and that they justify construction. That is, the cost of construction is fully justified as a river and harbor project and as an unemployment-relief project.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I am glad to yield to the Chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it contemplated that ships will go through there under their own power?

Mr. GREEN. It is contemplated that ships can go through there, I understand, under their own power. There shall be no impediment to ships passing directly from the Atlantic Ocean on out through into the Gulf of Mexico.

Under the provisions of this bill the President is authorized to accept any route which has now been surveyed, or he may have surveyed additional routes, and determine which is the most feasible and logical route for the canal. He is given full latitude to employ such engineering facilities of the Government, such engineering facilities in civilian life, and such funds as may be now available or may in the future be available for river and harbor projects or for unemployment-relief projects, or any public-works projects, money which may now or in the future be available.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman please tell us how much mileage will be saved if the canal is constructed?

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to do that. The various routes differ as to the length of the canal. The shortest route from tidewater to tidewater is less than 70 miles. The canal on that route would probably be, from the Atlantic to the Gulf, some 90 or 95 miles long. The route through the Santa Fe section probably will reach a little better than 100 miles in length. The route through the Oklawaha-St. Johns-Withlacoochee-Ogala section, which is the one shown on the map by the large marker, and which has been by many engineers considered very feasible, will be a little more than 150 miles in length.

Mr. COCHRAN. But what is the distance around now?

Mr. GREEN. Something like 1,000 miles from New Orleans to New York will be saved in distance, and more than 3 days' round-trip running time from New Orleans to New York will be saved.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then if this canal is constructed, ships from Germany, England, and other foreign nations, as well as our own ships, will be able to get to Houston, Galveston, New Orleans, and the other ports on the Gulf, at least 3 days sooner than they would if obliged to go around as they are now?

Mr. GREEN. There is no doubt about saving in time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman feel that that is going to be very advantageous to foreign manufacturers, as well as eastern manufacturers, in lessening the cost of bringing their products to the Southern States, especially the Gulf States, and seriously injuring industries in the Mississippi Valley, which have had that trade territory for many years?

Mr. GREEN. Of course, any advantage which would be realized by foreign vessels in transporting their commerce to America will be doubly realized by American vessels transporting theirs in and out to foreign countries, and the American people will be materially benefited by this canal. The Mississippi Valley will receive primary benefits.

Mr. COCHRAN. In other words, you admit it will enable the foreign countries and New England States to ship their goods by way of the Gulf of Mexico and into the Gulf States 3 days sooner than they can now ship them by boat, and that it will be of great benefit to the American people. Now I say it will benefit one section at the expense of the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. GREEN. But it will save more than \$36,000,000 annually to the producers and consumers of America in transportation costs. The producers and consumers in the Mississippi Valley will receive greater benefits than any section of the country.

Mr. COCHRAN. But look what it will do to industries in my section of the country, in the Mississippi Valley, that, as I say, did enjoy and now enjoys in part that trade, which will be taken away by New England manufacturers and foreign manufacturers?

Mr. GREEN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. I do not believe any advantage will be taken away from the Mississippi Valley section or the control of the Mississippi Valley. The river itself is more than 2,400 miles long; it has a basin of more than 1,250,000 square miles; and every industry in this great valley section will reap the benefits of this canal across Florida. Take, for instance, the iron industry in Pittsburgh. Why has it been possible for it to endure? Because Pittsburgh gets its raw material and its fuel over the Monongahela, the Allegheny, and the Ohio Rivers.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman look at the map and note that Pittsburgh is not in the Mississippi River Valley?

Mr. GREEN. But it emphasizes the importance of inland waterways.

Mr. COCHRAN. Get a little farther west.

Mr. GREEN. I go next to Youngstown, Ohio. Why did Youngstown, Ohio, petition the Congress to improve the waterway leading up to Youngstown? Because they found it necessary for them to get water transportation in order to compete with the railroads in the delivery of their fuel to Youngstown.

Now, let us go to the gentleman's own section, Missouri. I believe—in fact, I know—the gentleman is always vigorously interested in the improvement of the Missouri River Valley. They have already spent \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 on the Missouri River alone.

Mr. COCHRAN. Make it \$66,000,000 and it will come nearer the facts; and, even so, there is hardly a boat to be found on the river. It is said the river will be used next year. Personally I doubt it.

Mr. GREEN. Would the gentleman be willing to have the Missouri plugged up, let the flood waters go wild over Missouri, and let the rich bottomlands of his State be destroyed?

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will permit a further interruption, I may state that we have spent \$66,000,000 on the Missouri River. The gentleman can go there today and he will have a hard job finding a boat operating on the river. But that is not the question. I am saying the Mississippi Valley has already suffered enough by construction of canals.

Mr. GREEN. Now, if the gentleman will yield to me, where do the people of the gentleman's State ship their corn, their hay, wheat, their cattle, their hogs, their dairy products, and other produce?

Mr. COCHRAN. We do not ship the products the gentleman mentioned by boat. The barges do handle some wheat.

Mr. GREEN. With the aid of this canal the gentleman will find opened up for the products of his State a far shorter route to European ports. With the improvement of the upper Mississippi Valley, they can load their cattle on boats on the Mississippi River and ship them up to Chicago and save \$3 out of \$4 for transportation to the Chicago stockyards.

Mr. COCHRAN. What I want the gentleman to do is to realize what the Panama Canal and the canals in Texas have done to the industries of my own city, St. Louis.

Mr. GREEN. In order to offset any disadvantage which may have occurred to the States immediately west of the Great Lakes and south, this canal across Florida will counteract any disadvantage they suffered through the construction of the Panama Canal?

Mr. COCHRAN. Why, if the gentleman from Florida will permit, I have seen with my own eyes 8,000-ton ships tied up at the docks in Houston, having come from Germany and New England by way of the Gulf and the canal in Texas. Great ships bring the finished products of the New England States and of Europe away up into the State of Texas by using canals. St. Louis formerly shipped those products to Texas.

Mr. GREEN. Does the gentleman favor railroad or water transportation?

Mr. COCHRAN. I favor both, but I am studying that question right now; it is very doubtful in my mind whether or not we should be so liberal in the future in spending our money upon rivers as we have been in the past, certainly not until we see that we can get some advantage from it. I want to see if the rivers are going to be put to work. I have always supported appropriations for river and harbor improvements, but I cannot say that I am entirely satisfied with the amount of tonnage carried on some of the rivers we have improved.

Mr. GREEN. I am particularly interested to know whether the gentleman favors railroad or water transportation. The Mississippi Valley Waterways Improvement Association, and practically all other interests in favor of cheaper transportation, have endorsed this project. Also many of our colleagues from the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman from Florida might state in reply to the gentleman from Missouri that Congress has surrendered all control over waterways, that it is now in the hands of the P. W. A. So the gentleman's statement that he would have something to say about it is rather a mistaken assumption.

Mr. GREEN. I am inclined to believe that 9 out of 10 Representatives in the Missouri Valley and the Mississippi Valley are able to see great benefits from waterway developments, and from a canal across Florida.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to reassure the gentleman from Missouri about foreign ships dumping a lot of foreign products in his territory. If this map before us is correct, they all go in that general direction, do they not?

Mr. GREEN. They return here.

Mr. GIFFORD. Few seem to return; many seem to go.

Mr. GREEN. The Mississippi Valley trade, the Gulf trade, the Atlantic coast trade, in fact all American trade will be stimulated, increased, and benefited by this canal.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. COX. What are the several estimates of cost made by the engineers involving the construction of these canals; and what do the engineers say in justification of such a large expenditure of public money?

Mr. GREEN. The engineers have given various estimates of the cost of construction according to the various routes and kinds of canal. The estimates run all the way from nearly \$400,000,000 to as low as about \$110,000,000.

It has now been concluded that one of these routes, the one here with the large marker, the St. Johns-Oklawaha-Withlacoochee, can be constructed for from \$110,000,000 to \$143,000,000. That is the estimate of the Board of Army Engineers. The Public Works' engineers estimate that it can be completed for \$115,000,000. An engineer in private life, and a very good one, has estimated that it will cost less than \$100,000,000 to build a sea-level canal from ocean to Gulf.

Mr. COX. How are the American people to be compensated for this expenditure of public money as given by the engineers?

Mr. GREEN. They are to be compensated in the reduction of transportation costs, strengthening our national defense, and in many other ways. The American shippers and consumers will save approximately \$36,000,000 annually in transportation costs alone after this canal is constructed. It will carry one-third to one-half more tonnage every year than is now carried by the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal now handles from eighteen to twenty million tons per year and pays to the Federal Government some \$14,000,000 to \$18,000,000 a year in tolls alone. It carried during the peak years from 1928 to 1930 about 30,000,000 tons a year. This canal, when constructed across the State of Florida, according to conservative estimates, will carry from forty-two to sixty million tons of commerce annually.

Mr. COX. What did the engineers say with respect to whether or not this canal has any military value?

Mr. GREEN. It does have a military value. We all hope that wars may be outlawed forever, but according to the action in the other body recently on the World Court, it seems as if America must always provide in the future, as she has done in the past, for the adequate defense of our American Nation and our American people. I favor adequate national defense. One of the best methods to more adequately provide for our national defense will be the construction of this canal across the State of Florida. It will give the United States an unparalleled advantage and absolute supremacy in all of the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico. It will make quite impossible our attack by enemy from the south or by south Atlantic. It will make secure our position. During these times, when practically every nation of the world is in debt to America and defaulting and refusing to pay, America can very prudently look more to its national defense. I know of no project more important to our national defense and security than this ship canal.

STORM HAZARD LESSENED

With the opening of this canal practically all hazards of storm around the Florida Peninsula will be eliminated. This great benefit alone will almost justify construction.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. COLDEN. May I ask the gentleman whether he means this canal would save \$36,000,000 annually in transportation costs?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; annually to the consumers, shippers, and producers of America. It is a huge amount, I may say to the gentleman from California.

In 4 years the American people will realize back in transportation-cost savings the full cost of construction of this great project. The American people are developing their natural resources and conserving them. We owe to the American people every possible advantage to be derived from reduced transportation costs.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CASTELLOW. I should like to know if the gentleman has any information as to how many bales of cotton are shipped annually from the Gulf ports, say from Galveston, New Orleans, Mobile, and other Gulf ports, to Europe which would naturally go around the south part of Florida and across the Atlantic Ocean?

Mr. GREEN. I have not the actual figures. However, New Orleans is the greatest cotton-shipping port in the world. You gentlemen know the high percentage of American cotton that is shipped abroad. You may get some idea of that from this map, prepared by Mr. Henry Buckman, one of the most eminent engineers in America. He has prepared this map, and it shows here the ships as they were stationed in 1932 on the day and hour this map was made. From that an estimate was made of the ships which would pass through this canal annually, which is 1 ship every 42 minutes, day and night, throughout the year, over 40,000,000 tons per year.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Will the gentleman supply information as to how much freight would be saved on a bale of cotton from New Orleans to Liverpool via the route through the canal as suggested?

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to put that detail in the Record.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. CARTER. I presume from the gentleman's remarks that this will be a canal through which tolls will be charged?

Mr. GREEN. I rather think it will not be a toll canal. I think it will be a straight river and harbor project of the Army engineers for the benefit of the American people without toll. However, if tolls were to be charged, and I think they should not be, then it will retire its indebtedness in the form of 2- or 3-percent bonds in about 30 years.

Mr. CARTER. That is the question I was coming to, as to whether or not the gentleman had estimated the amount of tolls in the event tolls were to be charged?

Mr. GREEN. The tolls will be sufficient to retire the bonds in less than 30 years, and with a sea-level canal, 35 feet deep, there will hardly be any upkeep. We do not think that it should be a toll canal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been interrupted so much that I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman from Florida state how much is now being paid for the shipment of cotton from the Gulf ports by water to New England and by rail, and how much additional savings would be made by shipping through the proposed Florida canal?

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to incorporate that.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. What is the gentleman's idea as to a proper toll charge for that canal?

Mr. GREEN. The Panama Canal paid this past year between sixteen and eighteen million dollars, net. This canal will carry one-third to one-half more tonnage than the Panama Canal. I would say on the average there would be more than \$20,000,000 in tolls, if tolls should be charged.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman misunderstood me. What is the gentleman's idea of a proper toll for an average-sized freight-carrying ship passing through that canal?

Mr. GREEN. I have not estimated that; however, in justification for the project the Public Works engineers and the Army engineers considered the toll feature and in that regard, coupled with the unemployment feature, they all, I understand, practically agree it is justifiable and feasible.

Mr. MOTT. If a toll is charged, of course, the amount of the toll has to be taken into consideration in figuring the saving made in the freight.

Mr. GREEN. They have done that, and they found that the ships would pay the toll and use the canal rather than go around the Florida Peninsula. So it would be more economical even if they had to pay a toll. However, we are not building this, we hope, as a toll canal. It is to be a straight river and harbor project for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman tell me how long it will take a ship to go through this canal?

Mr. GREEN. I shall come to that later.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman from California [Mr. COLDEN] asked with respect to the difference in rail and water rates on cotton from the Gulf to New England mills, we will say. The present rate on cotton by ship from Galveston is \$1.75 a bale and by rail it is \$7.70 a bale.

Mr. GREEN. That is quite a saving; about 75 percent, and represents the saving the people will realize generally after the canal is constructed.

Mr. MOTT. How long will it take a ship to go through that canal?

Mr. GREEN. It will save 3 days per round trip.

Mr. MOTT. But how long will it take to go through the canal itself?

Mr. GREEN. I have not the hours; but I shall be pleased to put that in the Record. Is the gentleman interested in the Columbia River Valley project?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; very much, indeed.

Mr. GREEN. So am I.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA of California. Referring to the income from the Panama Canal, did the gentleman refer to net or gross income?

Mr. GREEN. I understand it runs more than \$16,000,000 net, or around \$20,000,000 gross in 1933.

Mr. LEA of California. Yes; that is true, and this last year it was over \$25,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. Nineteen hundred and thirty-three was a comparatively low year. During 1928 and 1929 it was much higher than in 1933 or 1934.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

TONNAGE OF MERCHANT FLEETS

The gross tonnage of merchant fleets of the world has shown a marvelous growth over the past 20 years; for instance, tonnage of the chief nations were as follows:

1913:		
	United States.....	7,886,551
	Great Britain.....	18,696,237
	Germany.....	5,082,061
	France.....	2,201,164
	Japan.....	1,500,014
	Norway.....	2,457,890
	Holland.....	1,309,849
	Italy.....	1,521,942
	Belgium.....	304,386

1923:		
	United States.....	16,952,018
	Great Britain.....	19,281,549
	Germany.....	2,590,073
	France.....	3,737,244
	Japan.....	3,604,147
	Norway.....	2,551,912
	Holland.....	2,625,741
	Italy.....	3,033,742
	Belgium.....	605,050

1934:		
	United States.....	13,045,037
	Great Britain.....	20,841,218
	Germany.....	3,690,990
	France.....	3,293,053
	Japan.....	4,072,707
	Norway.....	3,981,354
	Holland.....	2,618,016
	Italy.....	2,928,396
	Belgium.....	414,655

During the peak years from 1922 to 1930 the tonnage was greater than at the present time on account, of course, of the general depression conditions throughout the world.

UNITED STATES EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

In the year 1840 the value of exports sent out from the United States was \$132,000,000 and our imports were \$107,000,000.

In 1915 our exports had increased to \$2,768,000,000, while our imports were valued at \$1,674,000,000.

In 1920 we exported \$8,228,000,000 worth and imported \$5,279,000,000. Owing to adverse conditions throughout the commercial world, our exports and imports are not now as great as they were in 1920.

The value of imports and exports in the South Atlantic States and Gulf Coast States has shown a healthy increase.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I was called out of the Chamber a moment ago, and I do not know whether the gentleman has indicated the difference in elevation or lift on the different routes and the estimated cost of each one of them.

Mr. GREEN. I shall be pleased to put that in the RECORD. We brought out a portion of the cost of the different routes, and I shall be pleased to go into that further in my extension of remarks.

Mr. COLDEN. Are all these routes sea-level canals?

Mr. GREEN. In the surveys of practically all the routes the engineers have considered both a sea-level canal and a lock canal. They considered one of them, which is marked here in yellow, first as a lock canal with two locks of 610 feet by 1,000 feet and having 40-foot clearance over the sills, but my belief now is that practically all engineers have come to the sea-level canal in the interest of upkeep in the future and speed in passage through the canal, general economy and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the keen interest in this project because we realize the great benefit that will accrue to the American shippers after this project is completed.

I firmly believe that the President is going to see fit to allocate sufficient funds for the construction of this canal and will do so in the near future. As an unemployment-

relief measure alone, it is fully justified, especially when we think about the manner in which we have spent money, we might say, with nothing at all in view except to keep people from begging for something to eat, cutting grass and raking leaves and various minor projects in order that American citizens may earn something rather than beg for something to eat or accept a direct dole.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the colloquy a while ago between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Florida, reference was made to foreign ships using this canal. The major portion of the commerce that will pass through the canal will be coastwise trade, and foreign ships are prohibited by law from engaging in such trade.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; that is an excellent contribution and, I think, answers the gentleman from Missouri.

I believe it is time that our Government should embark upon public-work projects for the American people that will mean a permanent investment and provide returns to our people in future generations. A canal across the State of Florida will not be for this generation alone. It will not be built for today, but it will be for all time in the future, and when we compare it with raking leaves and cutting weeds and various small projects which we have had to resort to in the past, I believe, as an unemployment measure alone, this canal is fully justified and should be built at this time in the public interest.

Of all the waterway-improvement projects which have been suggested, this is the outstanding one which has been considered by river and harbor engineers and by Public Works engineers, and where others stand 1 to 1 this stands 2 to 1. This project offers an opportunity to do something for the American people for all time to come. This Congress cannot fail to approve it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. For what distance does this proposed route follow the St. Johns River?

Mr. GREEN. One of the routes, the first one to Jacksonville, would follow it only some 20 miles. The one to Middleburg would be thirty-odd miles, and the one on down to Palatka and across to Ocala to the Withlacoochee and the Oklawaha and St. Johns, the route follows the river, 60 or 80 miles.

Mr. REED of New York. The depth in the St. Johns River now up as far as Jacksonville will take an ocean steamship?

Mr. GREEN. The river from Jacksonville to the Atlantic Ocean is adequate to carry most vessels that will use the canal.

Mr. REED of New York. Has the gentleman the geological survey of his State here?

Mr. GREEN. Not today.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman has undoubtedly examined it.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. That shows that all of this proposed route is simply a sandy soil that can be handled easily. There is no blasting.

Mr. GREEN. It is easy to dredge. It is a muck soil, a sandy-loam soil; and such rock as is under the soil is a soft porous lime rock, easy to dredge.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman will find that his State geological survey some years ago brought out the very point that he has as to the character of the rock and soil.

Mr. GREEN. It is easy to dredge.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. In reply to my colleague from New York [Mr. REED], the gentleman will recall that the depth is 30 feet from the ocean to Jacksonville at present, and from Jacksonville to Palatka, 50 miles, it is about 18 feet all the

way, which will make a very short cut through. In reply to his other question, borings have been made by the War Department which show that this material does not require blasting. Also I remind my colleague that there was a greater fight put up against the Panama Canal than is made against this canal. It was contended at that time that the Panama Canal would be a failure. I am satisfied that the future will prove that this canal is just as meritorious and perhaps as well justified as was the Panama Canal.

Mr. GREEN. Some of the best engineering minds in the world, as has been said by my colleague from Florida, passed unfavorably upon the Panama Canal and said it was not feasible; that it was only a dream and was impossible of accomplishment. What Member of Congress or what shipping interest or what general American interest would say today, "Fill up the Panama Canal"? To the contrary, they are now advocating very seriously a canal across Mexico, many, many miles above the Panama Canal, to make a shorter route from the Lower California Gulf to the Gulf of Mexico and on to the cities of the East. That canal may sometime be realized.

Another reason why the Florida canal construction is imperative is this: The hope for American commerce, the hope for expansion of our trade, rests in Latin America. If you are going to expand, you must expand in a fertile field. Latin America is the most fertile field for trade and commerce, and the best market for manufactured products from the United States lies there. This canal will make accessible this Latin American trade, and we will find there an outlet for our manufactured products and for the products of the great Mississippi Valley, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Missouri.

My friends, you will remember something about the Monroe Doctrine. That was over a century ago, about 1823. The same thing that prompted the Monroe Doctrine prompted the action of the other body a few days ago—that is, America for Americans—and the American people, the people of the United States, owe to Latin American countries every possible bit of encouragement and every possible cooperation, and every possible benefit that can be carried to any foreign country should be carried to Latin America by the United States. There it will be reciprocated.

Mr. COLDEN. What is the proposed depth of these canals, and what vessels are they supposed to accommodate?

Mr. GREEN. The canal will be not less than 35 feet deep, 250 feet wide in the rock sections, and 400 feet wide in the soil sections.

Mr. MOTT. Has the Board of Army Engineers passed on this yet?

Mr. GREEN. The Board of Army Engineers' report has not been filed with the Congress. However, under the provisions of the bill the President is given full latitude to construct such canal and at such place as will take care of all vessels now afloat, using the waters of the Atlantic and the Gulf.

Mr. MOTT. What did the Board of Army Engineers say about it?

Mr. GREEN. Is the gentleman in favor of waterways and waterway development?

Mr. MOTT. I am; and I am very much interested in the gentleman's project, and that is one reason why I would like to know what the Board of Army Engineers thinks about it.

Mr. GREEN. Their report will be made in the near future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Colorado). The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has again expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. May I just insert here in the Record one observation? The gentleman said that the tolls were \$16,000,000, I believe?

Mr. GREEN. On the Panama Canal; net tolls between sixteen and eighteen millions in 1933, more in 1934.

Mr. SNYDER. The tolls were \$24,660,000 for 1934, and the tonnage was 28,567,000 tons for 1934.

Mr. GREEN. There was a great increase. I am glad to have that contribution by the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. I do not quite see why all of the shipments going to Latin America would have to pass through that canal. I should think they would go down south of it.

Mr. GREEN. Such trade as is utilized by the Mississippi Valley naturally will have access out to Latin America, and vice versa.

Mr. SNELL. But why would they not go right on down south to get to Latin America?

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman evidently has not made a thorough study of the situation.

Mr. SNELL. I am asking for information.

Mr. GREEN. Latin America is now available to the Mississippi Valley, exports and imports, and will utilize the benefits that are brought about by this canal.

Mr. SNELL. They would have to go out of their way to go through that canal, would they not?

Mr. GREEN. Is the gentleman in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway?

Mr. SNELL. It does not make any difference. I am asking the gentleman a question, and if he does not want to answer it, it is all right. I am asking the gentleman why they should go through that Canal instead of going straight on down south?

Mr. GREEN. Is the gentleman in favor of this waterway?

Mr. SNELL. I do not know anything about it and I am trying to get some information and the gentleman cannot give it to me.

Mr. GREEN. I shall go further into the Latin American matter.

LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

Our Latin American trade is showing an increase compared with trade in other countries and considering general world conditions. Take, for instance, our trade with Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. It has been as follows:

Exports

Argentina:	
1913.....	\$52,895
1920.....	213,726
1929.....	210,288
1933.....	36,929
Brazil:	
1913.....	42,638
1920.....	156,740
1929.....	108,787
1933.....	29,725
Mexico:	
1913.....	54,383
1920.....	207,859
1929.....	133,863
1933.....	37,510

Imports

Argentina:	
1913.....	\$26,864
1920.....	207,777
1929.....	117,581
1933.....	33,836
Brazil:	
1913.....	120,156
1920.....	227,533
1929.....	207,686
1933.....	82,618
Mexico:	
1913.....	77,544
1920.....	179,332
1929.....	117,738
1933.....	30,716

Our trade advantages in Latin America can, and should be, strengthened. There is no good reason why, with the proper development of our waterways and harbor facilities, and with proper trade agreements and negotiations, we

should not be able to obtain at least half of all Latin American trade.

The construction of this canal across north Florida will have a most wholesome effect upon our Latin American trade relations and will increase our tonnage, and in this connection this canal will enable our Mississippi Valley States to place their raw products on the European market at a far reduced transportation charge and thus enable us to compete with such Latin American raw products as are sent to Europe. It will make the products of the Mississippi Valley reach the European market from 1 to 2 days earlier than now and will reflect this saving in time in reduced transportation cost. Corn and corn products, livestock and meat products, cotton, wheat, and, in fact, all products of the Missouri and Mississippi Valley which are now sold abroad will be better enabled to compete on the European market with similar products from South America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the American Government is expending huge sums for waterway development. Let us take the figures, for instance, from 1802 down to 1933. The American Government, on the Mississippi River system alone, spent \$482,000,000; on intercoastal canals, \$123,000,000; lake harbors and channels, \$205,000,000; seacoast harbors and channels, \$648,000,000; operation and tariff canals, \$126,000,000; on all projects, \$1,619,500,000.

How about the Boulder Dam project with more than \$100,000,000. How about the Conowingo project with its huge amount? How about the project down at Muscle Shoals and the Tennessee Valley, \$150,000,000? And the Norris Dam and the Wheeler Dam will require another sixty or eighty million dollars to complete. Mr. Speaker, this is hardly a drop in the bucket compared to the other great developments which have been accomplished by the United States Army engineers and by the American people.

The Muscle Shoals and Tennessee Valley development projects can reach their full benefits and usefulness only through the construction of this canal. The development of the Tennessee Valley project will bring production of millions of tons of commerce. In order for this tonnage to meet competition on the world market, it will be necessary for it to utilize cheap water transportation. This tonnage to and from the Muscle Shoals and Tennessee Valley development will pass through the Florida Canal. Fertilizer produced at Muscle Shoals will by water be distributed to practically all parts of our country and from there distributed to the farmers of our Nation. They will receive the benefits of cheaper water transportation caused by the time and distance saving brought about through the construction of the Florida Canal.

Muscle Shoals as now being developed will be one of the greatest industrial centers of the world. Practically all products there manufactured will need cheap water transportation. The initiation of the Tennessee Valley project was the dawn of industrialization of the South and Southeast. With the construction of this canal, factories of practically all kinds will increase in this great heretofore undeveloped section of our country. The streams, and there are many, will be harnessed and offer cheap power for every section of this great area. Textile mills are already increasing, in fact, nearly half of the spindles now operating in the country are in this great area.

The iron and steel industry of Alabama; the phosphate industry of Tennessee and Florida; the timber and naval stores industry of the entire South; the pulpwood and paper industry and, in fact, practically all industries will expand here by leaps and bounds. A greater demand will accrue for all farm products of the Mississippi Valley in the South. The large saving and transportation charges will be beneficial to every State in the Union.

The vast resources of my own State will likewise be fully developed.

Thousands of acres of land will be brought into cultivation and noncompetitive production. The products of Florida are almost noncompetitive as far as any other State in the Union is concerned. Our citrus products compete very little with the citrus products of other States of the

lower Mississippi Valley and of California. Ours, in the main, find their way to the eastern market—those of Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana find their way to the upper Mississippi Valley markets, and California citrus products supply the great western section of our country and the central section.

Our vegetables are produced principally in mid-winter, when vegetables from no other State in the Union are in any quantity on the American market. Our competitors for winter vegetables are foreign countries—Mexico and the islands to the south of Florida—therefore the additional lands in Florida which are brought under cultivation will be principally for the growth of winter vegetables and will indeed be noncompetitive with any existing arable lands in America. Some of my colleagues may not realize the large percentage of these winter vegetables that are grown in Florida. Take, for instance, in the year 1926:

Florida produced 81 percent of the entire Nation's production of grapefruit; eggplants, 59 percent; table cucumbers, 41 percent; snap beans, 38½ percent; peppers, 61 percent; celery, 32 percent; tomatoes, 24 percent; early Irish potatoes, 10 percent. Florida produces almost all of the other common vegetables but in a lesser percentage.

The citrus fruit is one of Florida's greatest industries. In 1928 Florida had 274 car-lot packing houses. She had 70,000 acres planted to grapefruit trees, 50,000 of which were bearing. She had 160,000 acres planted to orange trees, 95,000 of which were bearing, different varieties producing grapefruit and oranges for the market at different times of the year. For example, the early varieties of oranges placed on the market from November to January are such as Parsons, Temples, and Enterprise; midseason varieties, from January to March, seedlings and pineapples; later varieties, from March to January, Valencias, Lue Gim Gongs, and others.

Another of Florida's most lucrative products is strawberries. It furnishes the entire country with early strawberries. Plant City and other places in its vicinity begin shipping as early as November or December. My own city of Starke begins shipping a little later, and sends to cities north of Florida millions of dollars worth of strawberries annually. Sanford, Fla., is a great producer of celery. I shall not undertake to enumerate the other products of Florida which would augment the great volume of commerce which would pass through this canal.

The American people have expended huge sums in the construction of canals, dams, and other great and beneficial improvements. The initial cost of the Panama Canal was almost \$400,000,000, which is about three times the cost of the canal across Florida.

The Conowingo, Maryland, cost some fifty-two million; the Keokuk, in Iowa, twenty-four million; the Ashokan, New York, thirty million; the Boulder Dam project, more than one hundred million; the Cape Cod Canal, many millions; and scores of other great improvements which are redounding great benefits to the economic life of America.

ROADS

Our Government has also contributed huge amounts toward the building of roads in America. We have now more than 358,000 miles of improved roads; some 275,000 of them hard surfaced. These roads have cost almost countless millions. Their further usefulness can be had only through the construction of a canal across north Florida. Our railroads and highways will act as feeders for tonnage traversing this canal.

MILLIONS LOANED TO RAILROADS AND INDUSTRY

During the past 3 years the Federal Government has loaned millions and millions of dollars to railroad companies in order that they may continue to operate. In this way they have carried an unprecedented assistance to this great industry in our Nation, and it is only fair to expect that the Government may well contribute to the fuller development of our waterways.

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. FIESINGER. I wish to ask the gentleman if he will place in the RECORD how many foreign bottoms would pass through that canal. I take it it would be a seaway that would be open to the ships of all nations, except in time of war?

Mr. GREEN. It will be.

Mr. FIESINGER. I wanted to find out how many foreign bottoms, or what proportion of foreign bottoms, would pass through the canal.

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to supply that, if obtainable. It is estimated that 10,000 ships a year will pass through it.

Employment will be given to some 30,000 people over each year of construction. It is estimated that some 4 to 6 years will be required for completion. Seventy-five percent to eighty percent of the funds expended for construction will go direct to labor, and as an unemployment-relief project it is thoroughly justified. It has also been suggested that C. C. C. camp forces may well be utilized in many phases of construction and thus eliminate a large item of cost. It is far better to expend relief and public-works money in a worth-while project of permanent investment for the American people than to lavish it upon minor and non-profitable projects. This project when completed will represent a permanent investment for all future generations of America. It has been pointed out by best authorities as the outstanding and most worth while of all possible relief or public-works projects.

I earnestly request the cooperation and support of all my colleagues in this worthy project.

So I call upon my colleagues to give careful study to this project. See what effect it has upon 38 or 39 States in the Union. Thirty-eight of them will be directly affected. Every one of them will have an indirect benefit. It will develop every great basic industry in our land. I speak to you gentlemen from the great industrial States, as Pennsylvania with your iron factories, and you Members from the West with your copper factories and with your steel mills and your electric equipment manufacturing concerns. Every basic industry in the United States will be stimulated by the construction of this canal. [Applause.]

REPRESENTATIVE R. A. (LEX) GREEN ADVOCATES CANAL ACROSS NORTH FLORIDA

Following is a copy of an address over the Columbia Broadcasting System by Representative R. A. (LEX) GREEN, Democrat, of Florida, Saturday, February 9, from 7:45 to 8 p. m., eastern standard time. He spoke from the studios of WJSV, Columbia's station for the Nation's Capital.

About a century ago a great President, Andrew Jackson, realizing the vast importance of such a waterway, sent a special message to Congress recommending construction of a canal across Florida. Now, another great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, will, in my opinion, construct the canal. It has been enthusiastically advocated for the past 10 years.

It was my pleasure in 1925 to introduce a bill in the Congress for preliminary survey of proposed routes, and in 1930 for physical surveys. Surveys have been practically completed by the Board of United States Army Engineers and the Federal Public Works Engineers. In addition to these Boards, the President has appointed a special Commission, or Board, to go into this matter thoroughly and report to him, and I have reasons to believe that the findings of this Board fully justify the project. The results are that one or more feasible routes have been found for a steamship canal across northern Florida, connecting the waters of the Atlantic Ocean with those of the Gulf of Mexico. Some of the best engineering minds in the country have concluded that such a canal is not only feasible from an engineering point, but will pay for itself in the way of benefits to the American people within the course of 30 years. It has also been concluded that as a toll or self-liquidating proposition, it will retire the cost of construction within about 36 years. The cost of construction has been estimated at 110 to 143 million dollars.

The total benefits to commerce and the people of the United States from this project, as determined by the Army engineers and the Public Works engineers, are more than twice its cost, which is a higher ratio than can be borne for any project of comparable magnitude now being considered by the Government. These benefits would reduce the cost of operation of ships by more than \$8,000,000 a year and will redound far greater benefits than this to the American public in the way of reduced cost in transportation. It is estimated that the producers and consumers of America would be saved \$36,000,000 per year in transportation cost. This is a huge amount, and within 3 or 4 years the American public will receive in benefits the cost of construction.

With this in mind, I have introduced H. R. 2785, which is now before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, and upon which hearings will be held. The bill gives the President full authority to acquire right-of-way and proceed with the construction of this waterway, which will be adequate to provide for substantially all vessels now using the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean. He is authorized to use all surveys and data of the Board of United States Army Engineers and to utilize their

splendid services for future surveys, if necessary, and to carry out the construction of the project. The Federal Government, through its Board of Army Engineers, is thoroughly equipped to promptly begin the construction of the project. Under the provisions of the bill, the President may utilize any existing or future Federal rivers and harbors or other improvement funds or may issue bonds. It has been estimated by competent engineers that the project can be completed in from 4 to 6 years and will employ 25,000 men continuously over the period of construction.

As an unemployment-relief project alone, the project is justified. Between 75 and 80 percent of money expended on the project will go to labor and to the relief of the unemployed. It will stimulate the great interest of industries of the country—the manufacture of steel, copper, electrical equipment, excavation equipment, cement, lumber, and all manner of heavy machinery in the basic industries which are so sorely in need of stimulation at the present time. These products will be drawn from every section of the country and relieve unemployment in practically every State of the Union. Likewise, the benefits to be derived by the American people will be realized in every nook and corner of the Nation, and will be directly felt in at least 37 States. The American people are awake to these benefits, as is evidenced by the large number of officials and organizations who have wholeheartedly and enthusiastically endorsed the project. Among these are Governors of many States, twoscore of United States Senators, dozens of Members of Congress, boards of trade, and chambers of commerce of many States, and many large cities in the Union, including practically all great seaport cities. Also such representative waterways and transportation developments associations as the Atlantic Deeper Waterway Association, the Mississippi Valley Association, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. This latter great national body, representing every section of the United States, has considered this project of such outstanding importance that it has recently endorsed it for prompt construction in the public interest. The Honorable Henry H. Buckman, who is vice chairman of the projects committee of that body, recently said:

"This project probably more truly deserves to be termed national in character than any other great public work now being contemplated by the Federal Government. Its commercial benefits to the Nation will be greater and more wide spread than those of the Panama Canal. Through it would pass more than 10,000 ships each year, representing the greatest flow of tonnage through any canal in the world, and carrying the water-borne commerce of all the territory between the Rockies and the Alleghenies to the Atlantic seaboard and overseas."

Mr. Buckman is an engineer of national reputation and authority. In comparison with the Panama Canal, the actual figures indicate that the tonnage available to the Florida Canal are more than one-third greater than that which passes through the Panama Canal and approximately double that which transits the Suez Canal. One ship every 45 minutes, night and day throughout the year, will pass through this canal. The actual cost of the Panama Canal was near \$400,000,000, which is nearly three times the amount required to build the canal across Florida. The Florida Canal will increase the traffic through the Panama Canal and will have a stimulating effect upon the commerce of the Nation in general. Every possible effort should be now exercised by the American Government to increase our foreign and domestic trade. There are now in our harbors countless numbers of vessels which will find their place in trade and traffic as the result of the opening of a canal across northern Florida. This canal will save to shipping craft on the average of 3 days round trip from New Orleans to New York. It will eliminate storm hazards now incurred by vessels going around the Florida Peninsula and will be a great saving to American shippers. It will increase tonnage on every Atlantic and Gulf port of our Nation. The existing water-borne tonnage now available to this canal is upward of 90,000,000 dead-weight tons of ships per year.

It is imperative that America fully develop her natural arteries of commerce. The benefits derived from the full development of waterways was centuries ago realized by European countries. Europe, with some 3,584,000 square miles of land, has more than 28,000 miles of normally navigable waterways, while the United States, with some 3,028,000 square miles of land area, has probably less than 3,000 miles of developed waterways. Practically all these older nations have realized the general economic benefit of full development of their waterways and the result in economy and transportation. It is true that America has embarked upon many worthy public-improvement projects and has expended huge sums for improvements.

Take for instance the Cape Cod Canal, costing a huge sum; the Tennessee Valley project, \$50,000,000; the Boulder Dam, about 150 million dollars; the Muscle Shoals project, \$150,000,000; the Osage project, \$30,000,000; the Conowingo project, \$52,000,000; the Coolidge Dam project, \$5,500,000; and a large number of other worth-while projects which are redounding great benefits to the citizens of one or more States of our Nation. The canal across northern Florida will greatly benefit the entire Mississippi Valley. The Mississippi River is more than 2,400 miles long and makes accessible one of the largest and most fertile regions in the world. The Congress is now considering the advisability of authorizing \$130,000,000 for fuller development of the upper Mississippi waterway. The full development of the entire Mississippi Valley, and its resources, rests on the construction of a canal across Florida, which is the keystone in the arch of our waterways development program. With the proposed development of the upper Mississippi, and the construction of the canal across northern Florida,

every possible shipping advantage will be equally restored to all States of the valley. Any disadvantages heretofore existing to certain States on the account of the Panama Canal, will be fully offset by the construction of the canal across northern Florida. Vast natural resources in this great valley will be developed and realized. Millions of acres of available lands in the States of the lower Mississippi and the Southeast will be filled with people who are now living to a disadvantage in congested centers. The pulp and timber industries, the iron industry in Alabama and Tennessee, the oil industry in the entire Mississippi Valley, the naval stores, and cotton industries, the manufacturing industries of the East, in fact, 95 percent of the capital now invested in industries of America will redound great benefits from the construction of this waterway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Colorado). Under the special order the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is evident, I believe, on both sides of this House that there is a large group of both political parties sincerely disturbed by the unprecedented expansion of Executive powers and the apparent willingness of the House of Representatives to obey the wishes of the Executive. In addition to this group there is a far larger and noisier conglomeration, which talks volubly on the same subject, but very manifestly for political purposes. They are untroubled dispensers of political hokum, it would seem, chemically pure and unadulterated. They are obviously trying to marshal all of those forces of Treasury raiders who fattened out of the Public Treasury during the glorious and hectic twenties. This group profited when there was little Executive leadership and when 500 lobbies held the House of Representatives almost in complete helplessness. They are hungry, disappointed, and rebellious.

In their anguish they cry out: Dictatorship! Bolshevistic! Save the Constitution! Rubber-stamp Congress! And so forth. Nevertheless, the basic problem of uncontrolled extension of Executive power in a free government is unquestionably upon us; and it is a problem which those who are sincerely interested in the welfare and the future of this country must solve.

Appearing in this morning's Post was this editorial, headed by a quotation from Abraham Lincoln. It reads as follows:

"A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations," Lincoln once said, "is the only true sovereign of a free people."

There is no question today that the administration is acting with the approval of the majority. Where cause for apprehension lies is in the weakening of constitutional restraints. In times of emergency there is always danger that a majority of the people will approve expedients which, if followed to their logical conclusions, would undermine the whole political system.

Checks and limitations frequently appear unnecessarily onerous. In a crisis they may prevent or obstruct the application of quick remedies. But when thoughtful restraints are thoughtlessly eliminated, the very foundations of government are affected. Representatives of the people, becoming reckless because of temporarily critical conditions, have often been known to act in haste and repent at leisure.

It is not a new problem. It first appeared in the early history of our country and has become increasingly important with our industrial development. Not only in this country but all over the world the passage of tariff laws, profit taxes, and police-power regulations have so intertwined governments with industry that any country lacking the executive power to function with equal facility with industry is bound to fail. During this post-war period of readjustments the extension of executive power has become so vital to the life of all governments that wherever the people have voluntarily failed to provide for that expansion the government has fallen and a dictatorship been created.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Does not the gentleman think it impossible for the executive of a government to have the same freedom of action as the executive of a private industry, because the executive of a government must act by statute?

Mr. HARLAN. England is one outstanding proof of the fact that it is not impossible. Where free peoples have

failed to provide adequate executive power, those governments have set up dictatorship executives. These officials have become obviously necessary in such countries. I shall discuss the manner in which this problem has been met by other governments in a few minutes.

Of all the great countries on the globe, England alone seems to have devised a system by which her executive power has been broad enough to perform its duties, while at all times it is under legislative control and supervision. In the United States we could not at this time adopt the English system of government without important constitutional amendments. It is even doubtful that the temperament of our people would welcome the complete British program. However, under our Constitution as it now exists, there appears to be adequate power in Congress to restore our Government to health.

To accomplish this purpose we must devise a system that will give us, first, adequate executive power; second, continuing legislative control over the use and abuse of that power; third, congressional leadership in the national interest.

It would hardly seem to be necessary to argue the need of a more powerful executive department, in view of the occurrences that are taking place all over the civilized world. When our Government was first established, the ox team stood for overland transportation. The family was the unit of production. The general store handled all distribution. It is a far cry from that situation to the condition of today; and with that growth our Government has become inseparably entangled with industry. There is hardly a manufacturing business that has not now become more vested with a public use than were the stage coaches, warehouses, and inns when our Constitution was written.

Those Members who are lawyers will recall the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Oklahoma ice case, and will recall that it is within the power of a State now to declare almost any industry vested with a public use; and with that vesting of public use in industry, private office has become a public trust, and government cannot escape longer its responsibilities.

In looking back over our history it would seem that whenever a great crisis has come there has sprung up from the people a President with vision and with the power in his personality who could take substantially the same course as that taken by our present Executive. Such men were Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. But a government which relies for its security on personalities and fortuitous circumstances is not on a firm foundation. It has also been most fortunate that when these great leaders have arisen they have found a patriotic Congress willing to sacrifice its prerogatives to save the life of the Republic.

But here again we are relying upon a government by individuals and not by law. It is the duty of the legislative body to legislate and it is not performing its functions by abdicating to any executive no matter how honest, how courageous, how able that executive may be. Our second requirement is to reestablish our legislative branch to a position of responsibility.

These remarks are not meant at all as critical of Congress. There has been no Member of this body more willing to vote for almost every grant of Executive power that has been required, and it is my intention to continue to do so, because I can see no other way out. It is practically impossible for a bulky legislative body to function with the facility that is necessary in times like these. But I do not feel that this attitude will produce a healthy government by which the legislative branch grants these powers and then releases itself of all responsibility.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Then, what does the gentleman intend to do about it, and when does he intend to start?

Mr. HARLAN. If the gentleman will allow me to develop my thought, I think I can cover it satisfactorily to him.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. For a brief question.

Mr. HOEPEL. I should like to ask the gentleman if he was guilty of voting for that iniquitous rule which changed the number of signatures necessary on a discharge petition from 145 to 218?

Mr. HARLAN. I was.

Mr. HOEPEL. Then the gentleman has no argument.

Mr. HARLAN. All right; if that is your opinion, a great majority of us felt otherwise. My regret is that I voted originally for the 145 discharge rule.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman from Ohio does not admit that it was iniquitous? It is the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPEL] who claims that making such salutary change was iniquitous. But a great majority of the House did not agree with him.

Mr. HARLAN. We have talked about the necessity for an extension of Executive power, the necessity for the extension of legislative power to cope with the growth of that Executive power. The third great need is the providing of legislative leadership in times of stress and practically all times.

The Seventy-second Congress of the United States, I believe, will stand out in history as an indication of the extent to which a legislative body composed of highly intelligent men may emulate a mob when there is no adequate leadership. History has given us similar examples, notably the Long Parliament just before Cromwell in England and the Constituent Assembly just before the French Revolution. During most of our history, however, great men have appeared in Congress commanding sufficient respect to afford leadership. Here, again, however, we are relying not upon law or a system of government, but upon the exigencies of politics.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Can the gentleman cite to the House any time in the history of the English Parliament when they delegated the taxing power to the executive or delegated other legislative power to the executive?

Mr. HARLAN. I will discuss that in just a moment.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman is making a very interesting speech, and I want to compliment him on it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Do I understand the gentleman to be admitting that there is no leadership at the present time in the 3-to-1 Democratic majority in the House?

Mr. HARLAN. I am not discussing leadership now; unquestionably there is leadership now.

Mr. MOTT. I understood the gentleman to say there was not.

Mr. HARLAN. My point is that the leadership now is dependent upon fortuitous exigencies of politics and not upon a system. We had leadership when Andrew Jackson was President; we had leadership when Abraham Lincoln was President; we had leadership when Theodore Roosevelt was President; and when Woodrow Wilson was President. We would have had leadership many times if conditions had demanded, but it happened we were not in a crisis, so I am not limiting it to those men.

Mr. MOTT. Do you have leadership now?

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman referred to the Seventy-second Congress. Will the gentleman elaborate upon that statement just a little?

Mr. HARLAN. The Seventy-second Congress was composed of a group of men in which the political parties were evenly divided. We had a Speaker of the Democratic Party and a President of the Republican Party. We had a number of progressive Republicans and insurgent Democrats. We were unable, therefore, to get any place with a particular policy. The President of the United States, on the most critical issue that any President could act, the revenue bill,

refused to lay down a policy to this House, and we went in about 435 different directions.

These weaknesses have been apparent to students of our Government for many years past. Woodrow Wilson discussed them fully in his book entitled "Congressional Government." Gamaliel Bradford, at the beginning of the present century, prophesied that unless the United States Government supplied a cure for the three evils above set forth, it would inevitably crash in the first half of this century.

During the forty-sixth session of the United States Congress a resolution was introduced into the Senate by Senator George H. Pendleton designed to strengthen our Government in the three respects just set forth. That resolution was referred to a committee consisting of Senator George H. Pendleton, at one time Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States; Hon. James G. Blaine, at one time Speaker of the House of Representatives, twice Secretary of State, and later a Republican candidate for President; Hon. W. B. Allison, for 35 years a Member of the United States Senate, and a former adjutant general for the State of Iowa; Gen. M. C. Butler, a Confederate veteran and a major general of the Spanish-American War; Hon. James T. Earley; Hon. John G. Ingalls, four times President pro tempore of the Senate; and Hon. Orville H. Platt—3 Democrats and 4 Republicans—a group of men whom it would be difficult to surpass for ability and statesmanship in any legislative body.

The resolution introduced provided, first, that members of the President's Cabinet should be entitled at all times to seats in the House and Senate, and that each Cabinet member should be privileged to partake in the debates on any bill affecting his particular executive department; second, it was provided that on certain days the attendance of these Cabinet members would be required for the purpose of answering questions of general welfare under the rules of the House and Senate concerning their particular department.

This resolution received a very thorough consideration at the hands of this special committee, both as to its advisability and as to its constitutionality, and also a unanimously favorable report. Obviously it would immediately bring about many changes for which the times were not propitious. It was very far in advance of the ideals of the people of that day.

For example, we were at that time on the verge of a great civil-service reform that came in 4 years afterward. We were on the verge of a tariff program that subsequently appealed to all sectional interests in the United States. We were on the verge of these pension raids on the Treasury of the United States later temporarily halted by Grover Cleveland. A great many interests did not want to see unified government by the House and Senate. Also at that time it was not always the custom to select the most able men in the Cabinet. A great many Cabinet members were then selected on account of their political power rather than for their ability, and it might be embarrassing to require such men to be constantly in the spotlight. At any rate, the bill did not get more than a favorable report, but it was a very thorough report from this able committee.

Since that time we have passed through this present panic. We have seen the inevitable growth of Executive power. We have seen the absolute necessity of creating legislative power capable of controlling and working with that growth of Executive power. We now know the need of unifying legislative leadership. The conditions now are very much different than they were at that time.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. There is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary H. R. 5493, which is entitled "A bill granting the members of the Cabinet the right of debate on the floor of Congress." Do I understand the gentleman to be in favor of this bill?

Mr. HARLAN. That is the bill I am discussing and advocating here. I hope to have a hearing before the Judiciary Committee on that problem.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. There are some members of the Cabinet we would not want on the floor of the House.

Mr. HARLAN. I will say to the gentleman that if that is so—which I would not care to admit—then this bill is the very best measure we could possibly devise to meet that situation, for the reason that if a man were in the spotlight and subject to public questioning, he could not hold down the job unless he were equipped for the office. He would have to know his business or he would soon appear to be so incompetent that his removal would be necessary.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman interpret the measure which he is proposing and advocating as a further extension of executive power?

Mr. HARLAN. I do not.

Mr. COX. Can it be construed as an encroachment of the executive branch upon the legislative branch? In theory, the legislative branch is the dominant branch of government, but in practice, is it? Is it to recapture some of the powers that the legislative branch has voted away, or will it mean a further encroachment upon the legislative branch by the executive branch? How is it going to work out?

Mr. HARLAN. I thank the gentleman for that question. Right at this point I shall read a brief part of the report of the committee on the former Senate bill, which gives the answer much clearer than anything I could say:

It has been objected that the effect of this introduction of the heads of departments upon the floor would be largely to increase the influence of the Executive on legislation. Your committee does not share this apprehension. The information given to Congress would doubtless be more pertinent and exact; the recommendation would, perhaps, be presented with great effect; but on the other hand, the Members of Congress would also be put on the alert to see that the influence is in proportion only to the value of the information and the suggestions, and the public would be enabled to determine whether the influence is exerted by persuasion or by argument. No one who has occupied a seat on the floor of either House, no one of those who, year after year, so industriously and faithfully and correctly report the proceedings of the Houses, no frequenter of the lobby or the gallery, can have failed to discern the influence exerted upon legislation by the visits of the heads of departments to the floors of Congress and the visits of the Members of Congress to the offices in the departments. It is not necessary to say that the influence is dishonest or corrupt, but it is illegitimate; it is exercised in secret by means that are not public—by means which an honest public opinion cannot accurately discover and over which it can therefore exercise no just control. The open information and argument provided by the bill may not supplant these secret methods, but they will enable a discriminating public judgment to determine whether they are sufficient to exercise the influence which is actually exerted and thus disarm them.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from California, but I will not yield hereafter until I finish my statement.

Mr. HOEPEL. It has been my observation that it would be of interest to the public if Cabinet officers were muzzled and prevented from sending to the Members of Congress and to the public of the United States every day a large amount of propaganda. I throw handfuls of that sort of mail in the wastebasket, which is sent to me by these Cabinet officers.

Mr. HARLAN. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech.

The Executive power has expanded with the needs of the time. It cannot and will not go any further than is necessary for Government, but it will expand that far. The purpose and intent of this bill is to put that power under the public spotlight and under public surveillance instead of, as suggested by the Senate committee, to keep it rather secret.

The adoption of the system which would have compelled the national administration at all times to assume leadership and to express disfavor on unmeritorious pension bills, logrolling tariffs, and harbor-improvement measures did not set well with Congress in that day. However, we have gone a long way since then. Our experiences from 1920 to 1932 have certainly prepared us for the need of honesty and efficiency in Government and especially in the Cabinet posts of the executive department. Our experiences from 1933

to 1935 have once more shown us that in times of stress, whether military or economic, executive leadership and expansion of executive powers are necessary to our salvation. We would need nothing more than our experiences with the Seventy-second Congress, which, by its utter futility, cast a pall of gloom and hopelessness over this country the like of which had never before existed, to convince us that leadership in legislation is a most important factor.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman mentioned several times about an emergency now existing.

Mr. HARLAN. Yes; I have mentioned that in my talk.

Mr. ALLEN. Highly paid publicity agents tell us that everything is booming; that after spending and sloughing away \$15,000,000 everything is booming and we are on our way. Now, is there an emergency, or are they lying? Are things booming?

Mr. HARLAN. That has nothing to do with the subject I am discussing.

Mr. ALLEN. What does the gentleman think about that proposition? Is the country booming, or are we under an emergency?

Mr. HARLAN. I will talk to the gentleman privately on that matter. The question of the gentleman is clearly out of order.

The thing I have in mind, and which the Senate of the United States had in mind, and everyone who has thought about this seriously has in mind, is to devise some system that will work, emergency or no emergency. This has to do with system of government and not a government by individuals.

Our constitutional forefathers never showed any hesitancy at all about the intermingling of the three functions of government in order to make that government effective. They did not hesitate to obliterate the line between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments when that was necessary to accomplish an end. They knew about the needs of war and they made the President Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, with all necessary power. They could not foresee the needs of such a depression as the world is in at the present time, and therefore could not expressly grant the necessary power, but they have left it within the power of the legislature not only to grant that power but to control it if necessary. Under the powers granted to the legislature we have created administrative agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission; that combine within themselves legislative, executive, and judicial functions.

The judicial branch of the Government has full and complete power to legislate and pass its rules of practice and then to execute those rules by providing penalties for their infraction. Congress alone seems to have very little judicial power and practically no executive power except the right to institute impeachment. It is true that the caucus, the Speaker of the House, and the Rules Committee together perform a number of executive functions vested in the British Cabinet, but this has never furnished a real executive drive for our legislative body. For the most part, we have drifted through the years in the hands of committees. Macauley once said in effect that victories had often been won by poor generals, but that no battle had ever been won by a debating society.

The manner in which England has ridden out the storms of the last century because its Parliament has constantly assumed its proper function of making laws and faithfully watching over their execution ought to furnish an example worthy of our emulation.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. I simply wish to suggest to the gentleman at this point that he is proposing we adopt the English parliamentary system where the responsible Cabinet members are on the floor of the Parliament and subject to query by members of Parliament.

Mr. HARLAN. There are so many questions being asked me, may I at this time, Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes?

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object if the gentleman will yield for a question which I shall propound in a moment.

Mr. HARLAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I trust the gentleman will not yield to any such proposition as that. The gentleman has evidently spent a great deal of time in the collection of the data he is now using. The gentleman is making a very informative and very interesting statement. I think to the gentleman is due the unanimous consent of the House for 15 additional minutes without attaching to his request any such half-way insulting proposition as the one made by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HARLAN. I shall yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. I asked the gentleman if his suggestion is that we adopt the present parliamentary system in England where, at the present time, the Parliament retains all its powers.

Mr. HARLAN. I will answer that question "no." The present parliamentary system in England has these features. The Cabinet frames all the laws. It is appointed ostensibly by the Crown but actually by Parliament. It controls these laws on the floor of Parliament and Parliament has no power at all to amend these laws. They either vote them up or down. The gentlemen in the Congress of the United States who object to gag rule, if in Parliament, would "burn up", I imagine.

Mr. CULKIN. If they vote them down, they have to go to the people immediately.

Mr. HARLAN. If these bills are voted down, then they have the choice of a new Cabinet, a reformed Cabinet, or they go to the people.

This measure which I am advocating, H. R. 5493, does not vest in the Cabinet the right to frame bills. This right stays with the Congress as it is at the present time. It does not provide for going to the people, because in the United States we go to the people every 2 years. It does not give the Cabinet the right to control the rules of consideration on the floor. It does not give Congress the right to demand the resignation of a Cabinet member, and, therefore, it is materially different from the British system.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Do I understand from the gentleman that this Congress has the inherent right to extend an invitation to a member of the Cabinet, or anyone else, to come here?

Mr. HARLAN. I may say that this Congress, under the Constitution, unquestionably has the right to pass such a bill. When our Government was organized in 1789 it was provided in a number of the bills with respect to Cabinet officers, especially the one establishing the office of Secretary of the Treasury, that he should appear before Congress and report on his office, and the same was true with respect to the Secretary of War. The fact of the matter is that in the early days of our Congress the members of the Cabinet did the very thing we are contemplating in this measure at the present time.

The early Journal of Congress shows that on Wednesday, July 22, 1789, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Jefferson, was attended agreeably to order and made the necessary explanations.

Saturday, August 22, 1789.—The Senate again entered on executive business. The President of the United States came into the Senate Chamber attended by General Knox, Secretary of War, and laid before the Senate the following statement of facts with the questions thereto annexed, for their advice and consent.

Friday, August 7, 1789.—The following message was received from the President of the United States by General Knox, the Secretary of War. * * *

Monday, August 10, 1789.—The following message was received from the President by General Knox, Secretary of War, who delivered in the same, together with statements of troops in the service of the United States.

The act of 1789, organizing the Treasury Department, provided—

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the revenue and for the support of the public credit. * * * shall make report and give voice to every project of the Legislature in person or in writing as may be required.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. HOEPEL. Does the gentleman believe that if we voted for this bill and put a crown on the heads of these tyrants in the Cabinet that they would condescend to see a mere Member of Congress when he endeavors to speak to them on public business.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, the gentleman from Ohio is making a nonpolitical statement—

Mr. HOEPEL. I am speaking in the interest of the taxpayer.

Mr. COX. And I do wish our friends would desist from undertaking to convert it into a partisan, political exposition.

Mr. HOEPEL. That is all the Cabinet officers are doing now—playing politics.

Mr. HARLAN. I will answer the gentleman from California.

The Congress has absolute power to pass this bill. There is no question about that; and if Congress has the power to enact this law, the Congress that controls the appropriation of money could compel these Cabinet members to come here if that question should ever arise. I do not think it would be politic for such a question to be raised.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Under present law, the committees which have more to do with framing legislation than any other body have the power to subpoena and to call Cabinet members before them and discuss the pending bills and get their opinion upon them.

Mr. HARLAN. I may say that that is done in secret committee meetings in which there is very limited publicity and in which the Congress, as a whole, does not have a chance to function.

Mr. MOTT. Is there any reason why the interrogation of Cabinet members by committees should not be done in an open meeting where all the Members of Congress could attend, if they desired to do so?

Mr. HARLAN. There is no reason for that except that this, as a matter of system, would make for publicity, whereas our present system makes for secrecy.

Mr. MOTT. But here is the point—

Mr. HARLAN. Oh, I want to go ahead with my address, and I wish the gentleman would not take up so much time.

Mr. MOTT. I shall not ask the gentleman any more questions, but I did want to get his idea on this. If we can have a free and full discussion by Cabinet members on legislation before committees, what would be the particular virtue of having them here on the floor of the House as well? What would we gain by it?

Mr. HARLAN. Two things would be gained. In the first place, it would tend to keep off the floor purely sectional and bloc bills for the reason that every one of those bills would affect some administrative branch, and having a member of the Cabinet in the House at necessary times and in the Senate, the Executive viewpoint on all of these local bills would become a matter of necessity, not a matter of chance. They would be here for examination. They would have to answer or else remain silent and ridiculous. If we have an Executive opinion on all these bills and publicity, we will go a great step toward removing local bloc bills from Congress much better than we do now. I ask now to proceed until I have finished, and then I shall answer any additional questions.

England during the last century has ridden through storms that have been just as perilous as any that we have gone through. In 1832 she had a potential civil war on her hands. There were riots and massacres in Manchester. The French Government fell, but because of the operation of the British system, very largely because of that, a civil war was averted, and their Government continued to function.

A few years later the Government of the United States was met by an internal problem no more serious than that confronted by England 20 years before. Yet in our Congress, neither in the Senate nor the House, was there anyone to speak effectively and with power of the desire of the people for peace. Sectionalism was rampant. A lot of fanatics in the North combined with some hotheads in the South and the Civil War was upon us. With a National Cabinet to speak on the floors of Congress for the sane good sense of the whole country concessions could easily have been made to avoid that conflict.

After the World War England alone of the large countries in Europe has been able to ride out the storm. We have blundered through relying on the genius of the world's greatest leader, Franklin Roosevelt, but forsaking legislative responsibilities. In the early part of this century, with labor troubles all over England, she handled all those questions, particularly around about 1909, 1910, with a minimum of disturbance, as compared to other European countries.

In speaking of this English system, John Stuart Mill said:

When a popular body knows what it is fit for and what it is unfit for, it will more and more understand that it is not its business to administer, but that it is its business to see that the administration is done by proper persons, and to keep them to their duties.

That is the purpose of this bill. It gives the legislative branch of our Government a control they have never had before over this expansion of powers that we cannot get away from, no matter what we do. We would not, I believe, adopt the English system, but this part of it, combined with the system that we do have, would give us all of the benefits and the strengthening effect, it seems to me, of the British system. Under this bill members of the Cabinet would be constantly in the limelight. Their conduct under discretionary powers granted by the Legislature would always be subject to legislative surveillance. Just the other day we voted in the House \$4,800,000,000 to the executive department to distribute in the next 2 years, and we have nothing whatever to say about its distribution. With this bill, while Congress is in session, the members of the Cabinet supervising the distribution would be constantly under inquiry as to what they intended to do, and this Congress, instead of lazily passing this distribution, would have some control over it.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Can the gentleman conceive of the British Parliament voting the Executive \$4,800,000,000?

Mr. HARLAN. I can, if the cabinet wishes it.

Mr. CULKIN. But the Executive has not said where this money is going to be spent.

Mr. HARLAN. I cannot argue that at this time. The very presence of members of the Cabinet in the Legislature would make the passage of bills presented to appease purely sectional or bloc interests very difficult, because the national viewpoint on these bills would be constantly asked for. At the same time Congress would grant any enlargement of the Executive power necessary to handle any situation, even as our constitutional fathers provided that the President in time of war should be the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy.

Lord Bryce, in speaking of this power in the hands of Abraham Lincoln, said:

President Lincoln wielded more power than any English-speaking ruler since Cromwell.

It is no less important in times of financial panic when our Government is fighting against forces of industrial destruction, that our President should also have full power to marshal our national strength.

Gladstone said:

The office of Prime Minister as it is now exercised is a proof and a result of the necessity which now exists in our political system for the concentration of power and responsibility in the hands of one man in whom the sovereign and the nation can alike confide, and from whom they have a right to expect a definite policy and a vigorous administration.

That was many years ago in England when they were facing a crisis not as bad as we have now; but Gladstone, one of the greatest men of the English-speaking race, said that expansion of executive power to meet these problems is necessary.

In commenting on the absence of such power in the United States Government, Lord Bryce says:

These observations may suffice to show why the fathers of the Constitution did not adopt the English parliamentary or cabinet system. They could not adopt it because they did not know of its existence. They did not know of it because it was still immature, because Englishmen themselves had not understood it, because the recognized authorities did not mention it.

I may say that the British system has been evolved since our system. The Federation of Switzerland has, of course, grown up since our Congress, and they have adopted almost everything else we had in our Constitution except the executive department. They provided an executive consisting of a cabinet of seven, but they provided exactly the thing that is provided here in H. R. 5493, namely, that those members of the executive cabinet shall sit in their legislative body, be subject to questioning, and privileged to debate. Switzerland did not provide for going to the people. If the cabinet is defeated, it is simply defeated and goes on with the next piece of business until the next election, just as we have to do in this country. But the Swiss people, having experience since the adoption of our Constitution, have seen the wisdom of a full legislative check.

I wish to introduce here some remarks of Hon. Hannis Taylor, at one time our Minister Plenipotentiary to Spain, who was later one of our representatives on the Alaska boundary dispute, and who was our legal adviser at the Spanish-American Treaty, and a very great man. After stating that the President of the United States is elected on a political platform and is responsible for carrying it out, he shows that there is no way whereby the President can express himself on legislation or in debate. I shall put his remarks in at this point:

The difficulties arising out of this system of organized confusion reveal two weak spots in our system of Federal Government.

The first difficulty consists of the want of power in the President and his Cabinet (a power universally conceded elsewhere) to sit as a political supreme court, and to interpret the party platform by reducing its general statements to the concrete forms of proposed acts of Congress. The second difficulty consists of the want of power in the Cabinet to offer such proposed acts in the Houses as the official expressions of the party which it represents, to insist under the rules upon their early consideration, and to take part in the debates upon them.

Under every parliamentary system in the world except our own these two fundamental rights are secured to the executive as practical expedients absolutely necessary for the prompt and orderly consideration of great national measures, which have a natural precedence over all other business. All existing cabinet systems except our own are modeled after the English, and that, we should not fail to remember, has been developed since the making of our Federal Constitution, in order to enable the reorganized English democracy to transact the vast business of an empire upon business principles and in accordance with the will of the majority.

The fathers therefore had no opportunity to see the workings of the English Constitution in its modern form; they had no knowledge of the advantages of cabinet government as now understood, and consequently it cannot be assumed that they rejected it as unsuitable to our conditions. For the want of something better they equipped the two houses with the legislative machinery known as the "committee system"; and in the early days, when the volume of legislative work was very small, that system was adequate.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. It is true that the President is elected on a platform, but all of the legislative members of the different States and the national legislative body are also elected at the same time on the same platform.

Mr. HARLAN. But the people look to the Executive to carry out that responsibility.

Mr. HOEPPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I cannot yield any further. I have yielded four times to the gentleman.

Now, I wish to read further from the committee report in this connection:

This bill will not change the Cabinet's legal relations either to the President or to the Congress. It will not make their tenure of office in anywise dependent on the favor of congressional majorities or on adverse votes of either or both of the Houses. They cannot assume undue leadership in Congress, because success will not prolong, as defeat will not terminate their tenure of office. They may be removed by the President at any moment, notwithstanding their success.

But here in the closing paragraph of that report is one of the most elementary reasons why that bill was not passed by the Congress. It says:

Your committee believes that the adoption of this bill and the effective execution of its provisions will be the first step toward sound civil-service reform, which will secure a larger wisdom in the adoption of policies, and a better system in their execution.

This system will require the selection of the strongest men to be heads of departments and will require them to be well equipped with the knowledge of their offices. It will also require the strongest men to be the leaders of Congress and participate in debate. It will bring those strong men in contact, perhaps into conflict, to advance the public weal, and thus stimulate their abilities and their efforts, and will thus assuredly result to the good of the country.

Now, for us to bewail the growth of Executive power is just like crying over the snows of last winter, or to bewail the happiness of yesteryear.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. A few moments ago I understood you to have said that the President-elect was the one man in whom the people of the United States placed confidence. Where does the minority come in? Where is their representation? It does not mean that because a man is elected President he meets with the approval of the entire population of the United States.

Mr. HARLAN. I am sorry if I said that the President was the only person in whom the people placed confidence.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I think the gentleman was quoting someone when he made that statement.

Mr. HARLAN. I am told by my colleagues sitting here in the front row that I did not make that statement.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman does believe there ought to be a place for the minority in any administration?

Mr. HARLAN. The minority now has its representation in the legislative body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] has again expired.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FIESINGER. My good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] asked as to whether the gentleman was arguing for an expansion of executive power or a recapture of legislative power. I think the gentleman from Ohio, in a very able argument, has answered the question. There are, however, one or two thoughts in my mind. We have in this country, under our very complicated social relationships, executive departments of the Government preparing legislation and sending it down to the Congress and to the committees of Congress. Sometimes the committees do not even hear the legislation, or, if so, very briefly, and then the legislation comes before the House.

If it is an administration measure, or if it has the approval of the President, I have observed that it is passed here with little question. I think it might be well to have Cabinet officers come into the House that we could interrogate and find out where some of this legislation arises. As a matter of fact, I think in the last Congress we had

several bills brought in under gag rules, bills that were of the utmost importance to the people of the United States and, in fact, to the entire world, yet we passed those bills and could never even find out who wrote them. I think it would be very interesting to have Cabinet members come before the House so we could interrogate them to find out if back of the legislation they sponsor there might not be sometimes sinister influences. Of course, in this statement I do not involve the President or his Cabinet officers; but it may be possible in their numerous and exacting duties that at times even they may have the wool pulled over their eyes. If the Congress could interrogate responsible Government officials upon the floor of the Senate or House, these situations might be detected. But, as I say, I think the gentleman has answered the question very well.

Mr. HARLAN. I mean to say that the expansion of Executive power, no matter what we do, is here. If the executive department now has the power to draft legislation, it would still have the power to draft legislation under this scheme; but the gentleman is quite right in saying that we in this body, as John Stuart Mills said, have the responsibility to legislate; but we have the additional responsibility of knowing first all about these bills, and this we cannot do now. [Applause.]

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman says, does he not, that we do have the responsibility to legislate?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FORMULATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Joint Resolution 148, providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution of the United States, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the "United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "commission") for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution, and to be composed of 18 commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, ex officio; 5 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States; 5 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and 5 Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. The commissioners shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be paid their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties out of any moneys contributed.

Sec. 3. The Commission shall select a chairman and appoint a director, who shall appoint, with the approval of the Commission, such assistants and subordinates as he deems necessary.

Sec. 4. That it shall be the duty of the commissioners, after promulgating to the American people an address relative to the reason of its creation and of its purpose, to prepare a plan or plans and a program for the adequate celebration of the sesquicentennial anniversary, and to give due and proper consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to them; and to take such steps as may be necessary in the coordination and correlation of plans prepared by States' commissions, or by bodies created under appointment by the Governors of the respective States, and by representative civic bodies.

Sec. 5. That the Commission shall, on or before the 20th day of May 1935, make a report to the Congress, in order that enabling legislation may be enacted.

Sec. 6. That the Commission hereby created shall expire December 31, 1939.

Sec. 7. That the Commission may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this resolution, but the same shall be expended and accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] desire any time on the resolution?

Mr. RANSLEY. On this side of the aisle we ask for a division of the time, 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania; and yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is practically identical with a resolution presented to the last Congress by our former colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Beck.

This resolution merely calls for the appointment of a commission of 18 to formulate plans for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution. The celebration will take place in 1937. The principal reason for bringing up this resolution at this time is to give this commission time to function. The membership of the commission will number 18. Three of the members will be the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the remaining 15 members, 5 are to be appointed by the President, 5 by the Senate, and 5 by the House of Representatives, the Speaker making the appointments for the House.

This commission is to report to the Congress on or before the 20th day of May 1935 with suggestions as to how best to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain to the House what will be the initial cost to the Government of this undertaking?

Mr. BLOOM. The present purpose of the appointment of the commission is to find out how the celebration should take place. It is to be principally educational in character.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will come next, of course.

Mr. BLOOM. I call the gentleman's attention to section 2, which provides that other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties shall be paid out of any moneys contributed.

I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that practically all the State bar associations, city bar associations, and other bar associations of the country have been circularized and are in favor of holding this celebration.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Does the gentleman believe that the passage of this resolution and the appointment of this commission will give the Constitution a stronger vogue than it now has? Will it help in that direction?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall pass that right back to the gentleman's own mind. He can answer it either way he sees fit; and I think he will be satisfied.

Mr. CULKIN. I was interested in the gentleman's opinion, for I know him to be a great lover of the Constitution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In answer to the distinguished gentleman from New York, I may say that in the last Congress the chief proponent of this resolution was that distinguished constitutional lawyer, Mr. James M. Beck, of Pennsylvania. He introduced an independent resolution.

Mr. CULKIN. And I might add he was a distinguished coworker of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

I would further call attention to the historic fact that the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Beck, did not run for Congress this time because he did not wish to be one four-hundred-and-thirty-fifth part of a rubber stamp.

Mr. BLOOM. I will say for that and a great many other reasons.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, while a Member of the House, in addition to sponsoring this particular resolution, was very anxious that the principle of personal liberty adopted by the founding fathers be restored. He took, therefore, a leading part in the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, which some of our

friends who have quoted the gentleman from Pennsylvania, were in favor of leaving as it was, thus depriving the people of their personal liberties.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I may say to the gentleman, the fact that Mr. Beck favors this proposition would incline me to vote for the resolution, but before voting for it, I should like to know what sort of a party this is to be? Is this to be a birthday party or a funeral?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentlemen on that side of the aisle are starting in to get some interest in this resolution. It looks forward to being a great celebration.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. I notice that it states in section 2, "After all necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties, to be paid out of any moneys contributed", and so forth. Is it the purpose to ask for an appropriation from the Congress to pay the necessary expenses involved in this bill?

Mr. BLOOM. At the present time, no.

Mr. McFARLANE. Later?

Mr. BLOOM. It depends upon what the commission decides to do. If the commission decides to hold a certain kind of celebration, why, they naturally will have to come back to Congress; and if they ask for an appropriation, that can be taken up at that time.

Mr. McFARLANE. Would this be an authorization for such an appropriation later?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. MEAD. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that his questions are answered in sections 5 and 7. Section 5 will later permit the commission to ask for an appropriation if they deem it expedient, and section 7 will authorize the commission to accept contributions which may eliminate the necessity of asking for an appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the use of taking up an hour on a resolution like this when virtually it is brought up by unanimous consent? If there had been anyone against it, he could have stopped it in a twinkling of an eye by making a point of order, because it is not privileged; and by not making a point of order, they let it come up by unanimous consent. So what is the use of wasting an hour over such a proposition?

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, this is laying the cornerstone for a celebration which will equal, if not excel, the George Washington celebration through which we have just passed. As a matter of fact, there is no question but that this commission will return with a well thought-out plan of celebration, which I understand has already been partially agreed upon. The Congress will then be asked to provide the machinery and the money with which to carry out the report of the commission which we are setting up today. Those who were here and went through the George Washington proceedings understand exactly what this means. I am not criticizing the George Washington proceedings, because I believe that we commenced and we should finish; but yesterday or the day before we were asked again to authorize an appropriation of around \$100,000 additional in order to complete that work, and I understand the \$100,000 will not complete it, and we will be asked for still more money in addition to all the other sums which were expended in that behalf.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman realizes that in the conduct of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, rather than it costing the Government one cent, the United States made a profit of from a half million to a million dollars in the conduct of it. That is a well-established fact, and has appeared before the committees, and, as a matter of fact, that has been one of the impelling factors which caused us to bring out this rule.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

I regret very much that the gentleman from Michigan compels me to answer his statement. The gentleman from Michigan called me up yesterday and said he had received a letter from a constituent of his who was very much concerned about the report that the Bicentennial Commission was not going to finish the publication of the definite writings. I told him that as far as the Commission was concerned, and as far as I am concerned, I had nothing at all to do with that. That was a special act of Congress asking for the publication of 25 volumes, more or less, of the definitive writings of Washington, which books are to be sold.

So the gentleman should not try to have the Congress believe that the money we asked for in that appropriation is going to be spent without return. Those books sold for from \$50 to \$75 a set, and the gentleman's constituent seemed to be more concerned over the fact that the publication of the books was not going to be continued, and I believe he stated it would be a disgrace if the Congress should at this time refuse to grant the appropriation for the publication of these books.

As far as the bicentennial celebration is concerned, the Government, according to reports from various departments, made a clear profit of 33 1/3 percent on the celebration. However, if it did not make a cent, but really expended every dollar that it received, it would have cost each person in the United States about 1 cent for the celebration. So when the gentleman refers to the definitive writings, that is one thing. If he wants to refer to anything of which I have charge or that came up during the time I was honored with the position of director, that is another thing. As far as the Commission, of which I was director is concerned, I do not believe there is a Member of either branch of Congress, and I do not believe there is a person in the United States, who can utter one word of criticism against that Commission. We treated everyone fairly, irrespective of religion, politics, or anything else. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. I did not mean to criticize the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]. I think the gentleman has done splendid work. But I was wondering if the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] should die, and there should be no one to carry on this new commission as capably as he carried on the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, what it might cost? I cannot compliment the gentleman from New York too highly for his handling of the George Washington celebration. His work should be completed.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Michigan flatters me too much.

I should like to read what my former colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Beck, said 1 year ago on the floor of this House with reference to this same bill. I quote:

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill in which I have been interested from the time I first became a Member of Congress. When I entered the Congress 7 years ago I introduced a resolution substantially the same as that now before the House for its consideration. I introduced it in each successive Congress, but the time of the proposed celebration was then so far distant that it seemed inopportune to bring it up at that time, and therefore I have waited until the present Congress, when, in association with the gentleman from New York, Mr. BLOOM, we introduced the same resolution, but, naturally, under a different number because of a rule of this House that there cannot be two sponsors for any one resolution.

So this is nothing new. On the fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution similar educational celebrations were had. I do not mean Ferris wheels or any such thing, but an educational celebration. This is going to be such a celebration, and I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] will agree with me that it is about time we started to educate the youth of this country not only in the Constitution but in the other fundamental principles of our Government, and this is the only way we can do it.

I do not believe the people generally realize what this means. There have been resolutions introduced in this Congress asking for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution in 1837. It is about time we educated the people with respect to

the difference between the formulation and the adoption of the Constitution.

I may say that in Los Angeles a short while ago they had a great performance with respect to the making of the Constitution, and even Will Rogers referred to it in his squib column, saying what a wonderful thing it was. So I thought I would write and find out what a wonderful thing it was. This is the booklet, *The Making of the Constitution of the United States—An Historic Pageant*. I thought I would go through this description of the pageant. I only found 62 errors—that is all. There were 62 mistakes in this wonderful pageant which the gentleman from California knows was a great success out there.

I know, and every Member of this House knows, that we should do practically the same thing with respect to research on the Constitution as we did on the history of our country on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Washington; and let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that until this celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Washington it was never recorded in any library that at one time in the history of our country 3 months were dropped from the calendar and at the time of Washington's birth February was the eleventh month and not the second month of the year. The facts were brought out in connection with our research work at that time, and the facts that will be brought out at this time with respect to the Constitution will well repay the Government of the United States in the education of our people on the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I think our distinguished and beloved colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has brought before us a most important issue. Under his genius he was able to rescue George Washington from the mists of forgetfulness and enshrine him afresh in the consciousness of his country.

I feel like supporting this resolution because, God knows, we need to rediscover our Constitution; but I would like to know whether this celebration is going to be in the form of a memorial service or a resurrection of the dead. I will be strong for the latter.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take very much time, but I want to call attention to a form of celebration that this House ought to be interested in, that we need tremendously, and that the country is waiting for us to begin, and that is to celebrate the Constitution of the United States by having this House assume the functions that are placed upon it by the Constitution, and begin once more to discharge our obligations to our country under the Constitution.

The fact is, we in this House have exhibited in the last few years the most amazing side-stepping of grave responsibilities that I believe can be found in the history of this country. I have grieved over it as a Member of this House, I have felt ashamed of my participation in it; but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if this House will celebrate the Constitution of the United States and its origin by returning to its constitutional place and discharging its constitutional duties, with honor and with courage and with the complete intelligence we possess, then we will have a celebration that will be worth while.

What are the facts? The fact is that over and over again we have delegated to the Executive of this Nation powers that the Constitution placed upon us. We have side-stepped our obligations. Over and over again legislation is brought up here, written by some inexperienced youth, not yet dry behind the ears, of whom we have never heard, who could not do anything more about running a private business than a child could reconstruct a Swiss watch with a cross-cut saw and a sledge hammer. Such legislation is brought here, and our great committee system, which is the very foundation and expression of the intelligence and efficiency of this House, is laid aside without question or protest.

We have at this moment our Public Buildings Committee and the great Rivers and Harbors Committee cooling their heels with nothing to do. They have been denuded of their powers and responsibilities, because this House has been recreant to its sacred trust under the Constitution. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we as Members of this House are summoned by this resolution, although I have no doubt that our friend BLOOM did not have that in his mind, to a resurrection of our sense of duty to a courageous facing of our obligations, to a reassertion of our position in the machinery of this Government, as provided in the Constitution.

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. With pleasure.

Mr. WEARIN. Does the gentleman know that the average age of the members of the Constitutional Convention of the United States was approximately 40 years?

Mr. EATON. I do not lay that up against them. They died, just the same as if they had been 10 months old. Young or old, they did not side-step their responsibilities. But I do not see what that has to do with this proposal. I take off my hat to a wise man regardless of his age. I have known some fools with whiskers a yard long and I have known some wise men 18 years old. That has nothing to do with this case.

For instance, the Constitution lays it down that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as outlined by Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, are the right of the American people. The Constitution may not do that in exact terms, but that is the fact. I have on my desk two letters that reached me a day or two ago, one from a widow who has been knitting at home for a nearby industry. She is now informed that under this administration after the 1st of April she cannot be permitted to do that. She cannot longer enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. She is denied her constitutional right to make a living. I have in my district great roofing industries. A man used to sell seconds from these industries and made an honorable living for himself and his family. Over night they cut that man out of his business, an honorable, useful, lawful business, and he is now on relief with his family. I could go on ad infinitum, ad nauseam, describing these conditions, but, Mr. Speaker, every Member here is too familiar with them already.

Take a great fundamental proposition like the relief bill. It comes in here with a few minutes' discussion, grudgingly permitted under a drastic gag rule. We could have voted on it as intelligently as we did if every Member had been blind, deaf, and dumb. No one knows who wrote it, where it came from, and we pass it on to the body at the other end of the Capitol, expecting them to discharge the obligations that the Constitution and our oath of office place upon us.

I hope under this resolution we will have a great education in the Constitution. It is needed in this body. It is needed in the White House. It is needed among the people everywhere. I think I am going to vote for brother Bloom's resolution. I am very fond of him. My only hope is that he is to take charge of the program, because, having resurrected George Washington, if he cannot resurrect the Constitution, nobody can do it. But while he is doing that, I beseech you all to pay some attention to the great responsibilities your people have placed upon you in sending you here as their Representatives. In New Jersey a man was running for Congress. And what was his platform? His platform was:

I want to be a rubber stamp for Franklin D. Roosevelt, and I hope he stamps me plenty.

Would he not have been an ornament to this House? A man with that mentality and moral infirmity ought not to wear pants.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Wait until I get through. I am paying my respects to one of the gentleman's new-deal colleagues. Such a man ought not to wear pants. He ought not to wear a petticoat. He ought to be put in rompers and furnished with a rattle and nipple. And certainly he ought not to be

elected to this great body which was supposed, in days gone by, to be the greatest deliberative body on earth, although now, alas, it is neither great nor deliberative, since it has abandoned the honorable and responsible place assigned it under the Constitution.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Deviating from any party discussion, I feel there is ample precedent for legislation of this kind to be found in the actions taken by the other great nations of the world. They are spending huge sums of money to instill a spirit of loyalty and nationalism into the citizenship of their countries. We recognize in this country that we are encountering the difficulties of these foreign "isms" and a restatement of the principles of the Constitution, as provided for by this legislation, would have a good effect on all political parties that are in conformity with the American form of Government. Does not the gentleman think that is so?

Mr. EATON. I certainly do; and if the gentleman will continue making my speech, I shall be glad to let him do it.

Mr. MEAD. And then we will both vote for Sol Bloom.

Mr. EATON. Yes. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished proponent of this resolution, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom], was rather unwilling to yield to me when on the floor. Why, I do not understand.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. I yielded to the gentleman. I think the gentleman will admit that. There were other people standing and I yielded to them, but I do not believe the gentleman will say that I refused to yield to him, because I did yield to him.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman was somewhat cavalier in his expression if not in his words. What I rise to say is that I am heartily for the resolution. I think the achievements of Washington and his hold on the American people was enriched by the handling which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] gave his memory in connection with the bicentennial celebration. I think it is a wholesome if belated proposition to arouse in the minds of the people of America a study of the Constitution. The necessity for this was signally instanced twice this afternoon. In a very scholarly address on a proposed change in our legislative procedure, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harlan] in a splendid speech lamented the passing of the prestige of Congress; that we had, without earmarking, delegated to the President the power to expend \$4,800,000,000 without any information as to how the money was to be disbursed. The gentleman admitted on the floor that that was not conceivable in connection with the English Parliament or with the English scheme of government, where today the English Parliament is supreme and legislative government obtains. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, in our country the American Congress is at its lowest ebb in power and prestige.

Immediately following the gentleman from Ohio, the learned and able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fiesinger] stated, and stated truly, that the responsible members of the Banking Committee in the last session of Congress brought legislation to this floor which was written by some anonymous individual, some erstwhile "brain truster"; legislation which they did not understand; they brought it in under gag rule and passed it. In view of the purpose of this resolution those are timely utterances coming from the other side of the aisle. So I think it is seemly in this day and age to give the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] full power to bring the Constitution, with its division of power, legislative, executive, and judicial, fully before the American people. This should be done before this Congress itself passes out of existence, by its own abject surrender of constitutional power. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is before the House by unanimous consent. While our friends on the Republican side demanded 30 minutes in which to oppose it—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, they demanded 30 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has said that several times. I do not understand what the gentleman means by it.

Mr. BLANTON. It means this, that if there had been any Member of the House opposed to this resolution, he could have stopped it coming up by making a point of order against it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish the great parliamentarian would tell us how.

Mr. BLANTON. Because the Rules Committee has no authority to report as a privileged resolution such a resolution as this.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish again the great parliamentarian would tell us why?

Mr. BLANTON. Because it provides for an appropriation, and deals with a subject that will call for an appropriation hereafter. I do not yield further. Of course, I know the gentleman from New York wants to protect action taken by his committee. It could have made in order such a resolution, but the Rules Committee does not have any authority to report such a resolution itself. It was subject to a point of order. I know if I had made the point of order, the Speaker would have sustained it.

I know the Parliamentarian would have held it out of order. Hence it is here by unanimous consent, so why waste a lot of time on it?

We all know what SOL BLOOM did with the George Washington Bicentennial Celebration. He did more than any 20 of us put together could have done. He put information about George Washington in the hands of every single individual in the United States, and they did not have some of that information before. I imagine that before SOL BLOOM gets through with this proposal he will have a copy of the Constitution in the hands of every school child in the United States. That is what we ought to have. If you want to get rid of communism and all the other "isms", put that Constitution in the hands of the school children of the country and let them understand it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman and I are together then. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I hope the gentleman from New York will put a copy of the Constitution in the hands of every Member of Congress before he gets through. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the Members of Congress have it. They swore here that they would support and defend it without any evasion, but sometimes some constituents in parts of the United States try to abolish it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not want to take up the time.

I am in favor of this resolution because I think it is going to be productive of good. I think what little money the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] will spend on it will come back to us a hundredfold. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALIFORNIA PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 101.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 101

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 94, a joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the California Pacific International Exposition, etc. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes from the Rules Committee and makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution No. 94, providing for the participation of the United States Government in an exposition at San Diego, Calif., which I understand is to open the latter part of May of this year.

Because of the urgency of the situation we are bringing in this resolution. The resolution reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee provides for a contribution by the Federal Government of \$350,000 that it may join with other nations in the celebration of this event.

I do not believe there is any need to discuss the rule, because the resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire any time on the rule?

Mr. RANSLEY. On this side of the aisle we will not ask for a division of time. Everyone to whom I have talked is in favor of the resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the amount authorized by this resolution ought to be reduced by at least \$100,000. Before year after next you are going to be called upon to appropriate a large sum of money for another celebration out in Los Angeles.

Mrs. KAHN. Los Angeles?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; both for Los Angeles and San Francisco; both are to have one. I understand they are attempting to consolidate them. I hope they will; they ought to do it; but you are not likely going to get Los Angeles and San Francisco to agree to it.

Mr. KRAMER. They agree on everything.

Mr. BLANTON. But not on expositions. We will be called upon to appropriate money for them. I guess Congress will help them; it always does. Congress is very liberal about such things. But we ought to cut down the amount asked for in this resolution; it is too much; get the report and read it. There are just two persons who have said anything about this before the committee. One is the author of the bill, the gentleman who comes from San Diego, who told the committee how he wanted to spend the money—and he told it in a very eloquent manner to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS]. Then they produced a statement from the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull. In his statement Mr. Hull says that he has nothing to do with the amount. He makes the recommendation that the amount should be fixed by Congress.

Now, I want to ask you Members of Congress who are called upon to vote for so many appropriations, why we should spend \$350,000 for this celebration at San Diego. They had one there 20 years ago. Why should we spend \$350,000 at this time for another exposition? They ought to agree now to cut down this amount by at least \$100,000. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to this effect. They have raised quite a lot of money by subscription. They are asking California to appropriate \$250,000. You can give them \$250,000 to match that given by the State of California, and that should be ample. That will give them \$500,000 in addition to the subscriptions. Do you not think

that would be generous? You should reduce the amount by at least \$100,000.

I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time to reduce this amount from \$350,000 to \$250,000, and I hope the Members of the House, in the interest of the taxpayers of the country, will support it, and help us to save \$100,000. Mr. Speaker, this is all I have to say.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, answering the gentleman from Texas, of course, the House joint resolution does not appropriate any money; it only authorizes the appropriation of money not to exceed \$350,000. The matter has to come before the Appropriations Committee and be approved.

Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars is a very modest sum compared to amounts we have authorized for other expositions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman remember that the record shows that the people of California, through private gifts, have actually subscribed \$6,000,000 toward this exposition?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is what the people of California have done already.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; and this \$350,000 is a very modest amount compared with other authorizations we have made for expositions.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat loath to take the floor on this proposition, but I was at the exposition held in 1915 at San Diego. It was an exquisite exposition in an exquisite setting. It seems to me that in connection with the forthcoming exposition, which will represent all of the country and all of the world, the Federal Government should not be niggardly. The pending resolution is simply in the nature of an authorization. If the Appropriations Committee wishes to cut this authorization from \$350,000 to \$250,000 they may do so; but let us give the Representatives of the State of California an opportunity to present all their facts.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. HARLAN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the exposition held at San Diego 20 years ago the Federal Government did not contribute a dime; and that this is the first amount that has been asked?

Mr. CULKIN. It was all the more remarkable. I was at San Francisco in 1915, and went down to San Diego. It seems to me this great international exposition requires liberal treatment in the interests of the cultural growths and material development of the Nation. I am for the resolution and the rule. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. J. Res. 94) providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. J. Res. 94, with Mr. DUFFY of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 94

Providing for the participation of the United States in the California Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor; and for other purposes

Whereas there is to be held at San Diego, Calif., beginning in May 1935, the California Pacific International Exposition for the purpose of inspiring national confidence and a higher appreciation of American institutions, stimulating business and industry, assisting the Government in bringing a more abundant life to its people, creating understanding among nations, and in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Pacific Southwest by Francisco Vasquez de Coronado; and

Whereas said exposition is worthy and deserving of the support and encouragement of the Government of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and respectfully requested by proclamation or in such manner as he may deem proper to invite all foreign countries and nations to such proposed exposition with a request that they participate therein.

Sec. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as "The California Pacific International Exposition Commission" and to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce; which Commission shall serve without additional compensation and shall represent the United States in connection with the holding of an international exposition known as "The California Pacific International Exposition" in San Diego, Calif., in the year 1935, and continuing into the year 1936.

Sec. 3. There is hereby created a Federal commissioner for the California Pacific International Exposition, such commissioner to be appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall select for this purpose an official of his Department who has had experience in, and is familiar with, the preparation and management of exhibitions, and who will serve in this capacity without additional salary. That the expenses of the Federal commissioner and such staff as he may require will be met out of the funds provided for the purposes of the Government participation in the exposition.

Sec. 4. The Commission shall prescribe the duties of the Federal commissioner and shall delegate such powers and functions to him as it shall deem advisable, in order that there may be exhibited at the California Pacific International Exposition by the Government of the United States, its executive departments, independent offices, and establishments such articles and materials as illustrate the function and administrative faculty of the Government in the advancement of industry, the arts, and peace, demonstrating the nature of our institutions, particularly as regards their adaptation to the wants of the people.

Sec. 5. The commissioner may employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary and fix their reasonable compensation within the grades and rates of compensation fixed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase such material, contract for such labor and other services, and exercise such powers as are delegated to him by the Commission as hereinbefore provided, and in order to facilitate the functioning of his office may subdelegate such powers (authorized or delegated) to officers and employees as may be deemed advisable by the Commission.

Sec. 6. The heads of the various executive departments and independent offices and establishments of the Government are authorized to cooperate with the commissioner in the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits; to lend to the California Pacific International Exposition, with the knowledge and consent of the commissioner, such articles, specimens, and exhibits which the commissioner shall deem to be in the interest of the United States to place with the science or other exhibits to be shown under the auspices of that corporation; to contract for such labor or other services as shall be deemed necessary, and to designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist the commissioner. At the close of the exposition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, the commissioner shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken, and any expenses incident to the restoration, modification, and revision of such property to a condition which will permit its use at subsequent expositions and fairs, and for the continued employment of personnel necessary to close out the fiscal and other records and prepare the required reports of the participating organizations, may be paid from the appropriation provided; and if the return of such property is not practicable, he may, with the consent of the department or branch from which it was taken, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

Sec. 7. The sum of \$350,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, of which sum not to exceed the sum of \$125,000 may be expended for the erection of such building or group of buildings and/or for the rental of such space as the Commission may deem adequate to carry out effectively the provisions of this resolution; for the decoration of such structure or structures; for the proper maintenance of such buildings, site, and grounds during the period of the exposition. The Commission may contract with the California Pacific International Exposition for the designing and erection of such building or buildings and/or for the rental of such space as shall be deemed proper.

The remaining portion of the appropriation authorized under this resolution shall be available for the selection, purchase, preparation, assembling, transportation, installation, arrangement, safe-keeping, exhibition, demonstration, and return of such articles and materials as the Commission may decide shall be included in such Government exhibit and in the exhibits of the California Pacific International Exposition; for the compensation of the employees of the Commission in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the payment of salaries of officers and employees of the Government, employed by or detailed for duty with the Commission, and for their actual traveling expenses and subsistence at not to exceed \$6 per day: *Provided*, That no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed plus such reasonable allowance for subsistence expenses as may be deemed proper by the commissioner; for telephone service, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, duplicating, and computing machines, their accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, uniforms, maps, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers and all other publications, ice and drinking water for office purposes: *Provided*, That payment for telephone service, rents, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and other similar purposes may be made in advance, for the hire of a passenger-carrying automobile, its maintenance, repair, and operation, for the official use of the commissioner, for printing and binding; for entertainment of distinguished visitors, and all other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Commission to fulfill properly the purposes of this resolution. All purchases, expenditures, and disbursements, under any appropriations which may be provided by authority of this resolution, shall be made under the direction of the Commission: *Provided*, That the Commission, as hereinbefore stipulated, may delegate these powers and functions to the commissioner, and the commissioner, with the consent of the Commission, may subdelegate them: *And provided further*, That the Commission or its delegated representative may authorize the allotment of funds to any executive department, independent office, or establishment of the Government with the consent of the heads thereof for direct expenditure by said executive department, independent office, or establishment for the purpose of defraying any expenditure which may be incurred by said executive department, independent office, or establishment in executing the duties and functions delegated to said office by the Commission; and all accounts and vouchers covering expenditures under these appropriations shall be approved by the commissioner or such assistants as he may delegate, except for such allotments as may be made to the various executive departments and establishments for direct expenditure; but these provisions shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit or permit any obligations to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated: *Provided*, That in the construction of buildings or exhibits requiring skilled and unskilled labor, the prevailing rate of wages, as provided in the Act of March 3, 1931, shall be paid.

Sec. 8. The commissioner, with the approval of the Commission, may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purposes of this resolution, but the same shall be expended and accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this resolution. The commissioner is also authorized to receive contributions of material, or borrow material or exhibits, to aid in carrying out the general purposes of this resolution; and at the close of the exposition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, shall dispose of any such portion of the material contributed as may be unused, and return such borrowed property; and, under the direction of the Commission, dispose of any buildings which may have been constructed and account therefor: *Provided*, That all disposition of materials, property, buildings, etc., shall be at public sale to the highest bidder and the proceeds thereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 9. It shall be the duty of the Commission to transmit to Congress, within 6 months after the close of the exposition, a detailed statement of all expenditures and such other reports as may be deemed proper, which reports shall be prepared and arranged with a view to concise statement and convenient reference.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, this resolution provides merely for participation by the Government in the California-Pacific International Exposition, proposed to be held at San Diego, Calif., beginning on May 29 of the present year. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs because of the international character of the exposition. It is expected that a number of foreign countries will participate and already 29 foreign countries have signified their intention of taking part in this exposition.

It was not necessary for the exposition that the preparation be made suddenly. In the year 1915 the people of southern California, and especially the citizens of San Diego, the great city of southern California, held an exposition at the same time that an exposition was being held in the city of San Francisco. At that time San Diego did not ask the Government of the United States for a single dollar to enable them to carry on the exposition. In the city of San

Diego they raised, by popular subscription, in 1915, \$1,000,000 to pay the expenses of the enterprise. They invested and built in a public park known as Balboa Park in the heart of the city, buildings and equipment at a cost of \$5,000,000. These buildings are permanent structures. So that this exposition is practically ready and prepared.

When they undertook this plan or enterprise for an exposition during the present year, they started out in San Diego with the hope and expectation of raising by popular subscription the sum of \$500,000 in that city alone for the purpose of paying the expenses of the exposition. Even in these times of depression and hardship those people were so earnest and so patriotic that they exceeded the amount they hoped to raise and succeeded in raising for this purpose by popular subscription, in the city of San Diego alone, \$700,000. They now come to the Government of the United States and ask that this Government of ours participate in and join them in their plans. I think their request is extremely moderate when they ask for only \$350,000.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG. Granting that this exposition at San Diego will be a very exquisite affair and granting also that after \$350,000 has been authorized for this one, within the near future the proponents and backers of the exposition at San Francisco will ask an authorization of taxpayers' money for a similar exposition, may I say to the gentleman that in my State of Ohio I represent a constituency more than a million of whom at the present time are on relief. Representing so many people on relief because of the dire circumstances of this depression, I cannot in good conscience vote for this appropriation.

Mr. KEE. I do not recognize a question in the gentleman's statement. It is merely an argument.

Mr. Chairman, as has been stated, these people in San Diego have invested this amount of money, and at the present time there is upon the exposition grounds at San Diego, either built or in contemplation of being built, an investment in buildings of over \$13,000,000, and yet the request before us is for merely \$350,000 for the Government exhibit, of which \$125,000 will be invested in the construction of a building to house the exhibits of the United States Government. The residue will be used for taking care of the building and for the preparation and shipment of the exhibits to the exposition from Washington or from wherever they are gathered.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. KEE. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is there not a bill before that committee now for an authorization which will call for a similar appropriation for an exposition to be held in San Francisco in 1938?

Mr. KEE. Not that I know of.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is there not a bill to that effect?

Mr. KEE. Not that I know of. No bill of that character has been referred to our committee.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. There is a bill before our committee merely giving the President the right to invite foreign nations to participate in an exposition, not only in San Francisco in 1938, but in Los Angeles as well, and I understand there will soon be another bill coming in from the gentleman's State for the same purpose.

Mr. McFARLANE. I want to know where this thing is going to stop. They are not asking for \$350,000.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. There is nothing in this bill asking for an appropriation.

Mr. McFARLANE. That will come up later.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. And the gentleman's State is coming in last.

Mr. McFARLANE. We are having an honest-to-goodness celebration down there in Texas, and we are entitled to it.

Mr. LEA of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA of California. Referring to the statement with reference to unemployment, may I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that 4,000 men are now employed in the preparation of this exposition?

Mr. KEE. Yes; and have been for many months.

Mr. LEA of California. Hundreds of them have been employed for over a year and many of them for a year and a half, and the new construction will amount to at least two and a half and probably over three million dollars.

Mr. KEE. In fact, more than that I am informed.

As to the benefits to be derived by the people of this country, it has been shown as a geographical fact that the international line between Mexico and the United States is only 16 miles from San Diego.

It is a matter of record and of fact that from four and a half to five and a half million people cross the international boundary line at San Diego into Mexico or from Mexico into the United States in 1 year. At the 1915 exposition at San Diego there was an attendance of five and a half million people. It is expected that this exposition will draw an attendance of over seven and a half million people.

By the participation of the Government of the United States in this exposition we are sending something out to the West for the education of the people out there, something that they otherwise would possibly never have the privilege or opportunity of seeing. We who are fortunate enough to live near the city of Washington are familiar with these historic objects that we expect the Government to send to the West for this exposition. There will be millions of people who will visit the exposition and will see and appreciate these interesting things about their own Government, and this will be an education to a large body of citizens who otherwise would not have such opportunity.

I hope it will be the pleasure of this House to adopt the resolution.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. I notice the total authorization is \$350,000. Does the gentleman think, in view of the history of these enterprises, this will be the total and final charge on the Federal Treasury?

Mr. KEE. I anticipate it will. I am advised that a great number of these exhibits that the Government is expected to send out have not yet been unpacked from the Chicago Exposition and can be sent out West with perfect ease.

Mr. LUDLOW. Let me make a prediction: If precedent is followed, San Diego can be depended on to come back here several times for further appropriations. I hope I am not a good prophet in this instance, but I would bet on that prediction. I greatly admire the loyalty of California's Congressmen to their State, but I cannot go along with them. In this period of unprecedented depression, with the country laboring beneath a burden of debt and taxation as never before, with millions on relief rolls and more millions not knowing where their next meal is coming from, I am not going to waste any of the taxpayers' money on expositions. Furthermore, I am going to predict that more appropriations will be sought later.

Mr. KEE. I think the gentleman is anticipating unduly. Let those questions be settled when they arise.

Mr. LUDLOW. The usual history of such matters is that the camel's nose gets into the Treasury, and the body of the camel generally follows.

Mr. KEE. I am hopeful this will be an exception to the gentleman's rule.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURNHAM].

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] has so completely and ably described and explained this resolution that there is very little left for me to say. I should, however, like to make a brief statement, having been one of the organizers of the exposition held in San Diego in 1915 and its active vice president.

Twenty years ago the city of San Diego, then a comparatively small community, held an international exposition to

celebrate the completion of the Panama Canal. She did it without one dollar of Federal aid. She acted as host to the world—with credit to herself, the State, and the Nation.

That exposition was held in beautiful Balboa Park—a 1,400-acre tract in the very heart of the city. In consequence, that enterprising community was left a wonderful legacy, a glorious heritage of luxuriant trees and shrubs and palms, and tropical foliage—many rare specimens now grown to majestic proportions—a riot of exotic beauty. There is probably no setting in all the world quite so beautiful and adaptable for an international exposition.

Another feature of that legacy, of which the city is justly proud, is a group of internationally renowned buildings of Spanish colonial architecture designed by the late Bertram Goodhue—a magnificent nucleus, costing millions of dollars, around which is being built a second and far greater enterprise—the California-Pacific International Exposition.

The original buildings, many of which are of concrete construction, have been completely restored. More than a score of new buildings are now being erected, and the whole exposition ensemble is 75 percent complete. Some 2,000 men have been at work for nearly a year—many of them taken from the relief rolls. It has been a boon to the unemployed, a godsend to our citizens.

I mention this in connection with the statement made by our friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Young] that there is so much unemployment in the country and so much being spent on relief, we can ill afford to spend a dollar for exposition purposes. As I have said, we have had more than 2,000 men employed for nearly 1 year and many of them were taken off of the relief rolls. It has been a boon to the unemployed, a godsend to the citizens of not only California but of the entire Pacific coast.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question with reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BURNHAM. Yes; I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUCK. Is it not a fact that the purpose of this exposition is to develop additional trade, locally, nationally, and internationally, which will put people to work throughout the country?

Mr. BURNHAM. We are hopeful this will help to restore confidence not only on the Pacific coast but in the entire United States.

A pictorial story of men working on the exposition project was made in December by the major news-reel companies, which many of you no doubt have seen upon the screen.

An article appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner under date of January 28, 1935, stated in part as follows:

The initial funds for the fair were raised by citizens of San Diego in the largest per capita subscription ever made for an exposition. Leading citizens of Los Angeles have cooperated in assuring the success of the inspiring project, which already has given employment to thousands and which is expected to attract a record number of visitors to southern California next summer.

In this connection I might state that the Government survey shows five and one-half million people cross the Mexican border at San Diego each year. I mention this to show the possibilities for attendance. From 11 Western States alone San Diego can bid for approximately 15,000,000 visitors to the forthcoming exposition, which will open on the 29th of May this year and continue for a period of 10 months.

Mr. LUDLOW. What is to be the admission charge?

Mr. BURNHAM. I cannot tell the gentleman what the admission charge is or will be, but I do hope and believe that the Members of Congress will be supplied with term passes. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUDLOW. If you have 15,000,000 visitors, with a very moderate admission charge, could not this project go on its own steam without a Federal appropriation?

Mr. BURNHAM. It is going on its own steam, and we are not asking for a Federal appropriation for the operation of this exposition.

Ponder this fact: Twenty years ago San Diego's exposition attendance was close to 5,000,000, with comparatively poor means of transportation and a much smaller population, not

more than one-fourth the present population; whereas today we have excellent paved highways, improved train service, overland motor coaches, airplanes, and steamship lines calling at San Diego, which is the first port of call on the Pacific coast of the United States north of the Panama Canal. Therefore I contend it requires no great stretch of the imagination to assume that the attendance will be sufficient to insure the success of the enterprise. Visitors will come not alone from the territory west of the Rockies but from all parts of the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. If this bill is passed by the House and the Senate and becomes law, the first section of it will authorize the President of the United States to invite foreign countries to participate. Our friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] has stated that 29 countries have already signified their intention of coming here. Have they done this before they were invited?

Mr. BURNHAM. I may say to my friend that they have been invited unofficially, and they have signified their intention in the matter. I will show the gentleman letters and telegrams from Secretary Hull and from our good friend Josephus Daniels, at the city of Mexico, who is our Ambassador in that country.

Mr. BLANTON. Surely no official of the Government would invite them before they had been authorized by Congress to do so.

Mr. BURNHAM. Unofficially, yes; and our exposition officials have invited them, and many foreign countries have had their consuls there.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit one further observation, he will notice that Secretary Hull's statement in the report said that—

Of course, only those countries nearby could be invited in the short length of time.

Mr. BURNHAM. I will be pleased to read his letter later.

I received a copy of the San Diego Union last evening, dated February 9, wherein it was mentioned that Mr. and Mrs. George H. Lorimer, Sam Blythe, and Harry Condon, associated with Mr. Lorimer on the Saturday Evening Post, were spending a week in San Diego. The article quoted Mr. Lorimer as follows:

This morning we motored through Balboa Park to see what you are doing in building the coming exposition. It looks like real business out there, and I am sure that you are going to have a show that will attract world-wide interest. I have said many times that your first exposition was one of the world's finest. Don't try to make it too big. Your charming Balboa Park is in itself a thing of beauty, unexcelled anywhere.

It will interest you to know something of the financial structure of the California-Pacific International Exposition. The company was incorporated under the laws of the State of California, without capital stock and on a nonprofit basis. No bonds or stock have been nor will be issued. The funds necessary for operation were secured by popular subscription and were oversubscribed 40 percent. The new construction is being financed by commercial and industrial exhibitors, States, and foreign countries. The enterprise is fully financed, both as to promotion and operation, and will represent an investment of twelve and one-half million dollars.

The California-Pacific International Exposition is not designed to celebrate, or commemorate, some event of the dim and moldy past, but it is for the more practical purpose, as stated in the resolution now under consideration, of inspiring national confidence and a higher appreciation of American institutions, stimulating business and industry, assisting the Government in bringing a more abundant life to its people, creating understanding among nations, and, incidentally, commemorating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Pacific Southwest by Francisco Vasquez de Coronado.

It will depict the progress of mankind up through the four centuries since Cabrillo sailed into the Bay of San Diego in 1542. It will show the great progress achieved in the arts, sciences, culture, and education; it will stimulate

recovery on the Pacific coast and encourage good will among the nations of the world.

From all parts of the globe will be assembled the strange and picturesque wonders of far-away scenes, peoples, homes, industries, quaint customs—all phases of life at home and abroad—from the Plaza of Pacific Relations will fly the flags of 29 nations.

Many of America's great industrial and commercial enterprises will be represented. For instance, the Ford Motor Co. is erecting a building to cost \$300,000. Business of all kinds and character are contributing most liberally to this spectacle of man's versatility. Displays of art, science, commerce, industry, agriculture, horticulture, aviation, and the Navy—in fact, all phases of human endeavor will be presented in new life and motion. It will afford millions of persons an opportunity to observe, in a new, dramatic, vital, and understandable way, the marvels of 1935.

We are now asking the Federal Government—the United States of America—to participate. I refrained from introducing this resolution until I had had an opportunity to confer with the President and to ascertain whether it tied in to his recovery program. I know that I am betraying no confidence when I tell you that he said, "Fine; go ahead." He even voluntarily called the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and voiced his approval. He attended our exposition in 1915 and hopes to come out this summer.

This resolution provides for a commission of three, composed of the Secretaries of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, all of whom also have shown great interest and real enthusiasm. They are very desirous of cooperating.

The resolution also authorizes an appropriation of \$350,000, of which amount not to exceed \$125,000 may be expended for the erection of such a building as the commission may deem adequate and proper. The remainder of the \$350,000 is to be used for the installation and maintenance of a governmental exhibit.

I urge you in the interest of recovery to support this resolution and help to make possible one of the most beautiful expositions that this country or the world has ever seen.

And we want you to come to San Diego during the period of the exposition. You will enjoy the beauty and charm of its surroundings. You will find much to interest you. And the good people of San Diego will exert every effort to make you feel that you are among friends. [Applause.]

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNHAM. Yes.

Mr. EATON. To ask the gentleman to clear up one point for the benefit of the Members of the House. This appropriation asked for is to be used entirely by the Government of the United States in the preparation and exhibition of its own exhibit in its own building, is it not, and not a dollar of it is to be used to advance the institution itself?

Mr. BURNHAM. The gentleman is absolutely right. The exposition proper is fully financed.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNHAM. Yes.

Mr. KRAMER. How much of this money is going directly into this Government building to be constructed?

Mr. BURNHAM. The resolution provides not to exceed \$125,000 is to be used in the construction of the building. The plans have been drawn. The building can be constructed for that. It will be a building of reinforced concrete.

Mr. KRAMER. Then, if it costs \$100,000, the other \$50,000 would revert to the Treasury, or will that be expended for some other purpose?

Mr. BURNHAM. That is up to the Commission, which is to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. Our exposition officials would have absolutely no control over that fund.

Mr. KRAMER. Who is going to have control of it?

Mr. BURNHAM. The Commission.

Mr. KRAMER. What is going to become of the other money being appropriated?

Mr. BURNHAM. What other money?

Mr. KRAMER. The other \$150,000 or \$125,000?

Mr. BURNHAM. The resolution authorizes an appropriation of \$350,000, of which not to exceed \$125,000 is to be used in the construction of a building, the balance to be used for the installation and maintenance of the exhibit.

Mr. KRAMER. I understand there is some language in the resolution which provides for some expenditure in the District of Columbia. To what does that refer?

Mr. BURNHAM. That is the customary phraseology in all resolutions pertaining to expositions, as I understand it.

Mr. KRAMER. It does not mean that any railroad fare is going to be paid for anyone, or the expenses of anyone while here?

Mr. BURNHAM. Positively it does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here for several minutes listening to my colleagues and the proponents of House Joint Resolution No. 94 paint a beautiful picture of what a wonderful time we will have out in San Diego, Calif., at the California-Pacific International Exposition if we will only appropriate \$350,000 of the taxpayers' money so that the United States may participate in such an exposition. We are reminded of the wonderful educational opportunities that will flow from this celebration. I, for one, am interested in all educational opportunities; but I am unable to see the wonderful opportunities that may be had from the expenditure of this sum of money on the part of our Government. We are reminded that 29 foreign countries have signified their willingness to attend this exposition and that it will mean much to us in bringing about good will among the foreign nations. The greatest good will that could possibly come to this country would be in the payment of the debts which the foreign countries now owe us. It seems that a great number of the foreign nations are already well acquainted with us and that we are so fond of them we tell them they can pay us when it is convenient, and that in the meantime if they need any more funds America will furnish it to them. I do not think they should be invited to come to this country until they realize their just obligations to us and make some effort to discharge them. It is urged by my good friends that \$350,000 is a small sum of money, that the United States has made a practice in the past of appropriating money to expositions of this kind, and that no one should object to this authorization. It is true that this sum of money may seem small to the majority of the Members of this House, but to me it is a large sum. When we think about the number of unemployed people in America, the men, women, and children suffering because of hunger and the disabled veterans who have been denied their disability and pension allowance because of economy, and with the taxes so high until our citizens are unable to save their homes, I think it high time that the Congress put an end to appropriating the taxpayers' money for expositions. The sooner we stop this practice the better off we will be. I do not object just because the exposition will be held in the beautiful city of San Diego, because I know that they have beautiful cities in the State of California; but if we vote this appropriation it will not be long until we will be asked to appropriate a like or greater sum for another exposition in Texas, Illinois, and a great many other States, with the result that there will be no end to the spending of the taxpayers' money. My first thought is of America and her distressed citizens, and I must register my protest against the appropriation of this money, and the offer from the gentleman from California to furnish the Members of Congress with free tickets to the exposition does not change my position. Let us first provide employment to our people who are out of employment, care for the ones who are unable to work, provide a reasonable sum of money as a pension for the old people, pay the adjusted-service certificates of the veterans, provide compensation for the disabled veterans of our wars, and then we can appropriate money for an international exposition, provided we can find any money to appropriate for that purpose. If you

are determined to authorize the expenditure of any money for this exposition, I do hope that you will agree to cut it down to the sum suggested by the gentleman from Texas. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts yields 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Federal commissioner for the California-Pacific International Exposition, such commissioner to be appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall select for this purpose an official of his Department who has had experience in, and is familiar with, the preparation and management of exhibitions, and who will serve in this capacity without additional salary. That the expenses of the Federal commissioner and such staff as he may require will be met out of the funds provided for the purposes of the Government participation in the exposition.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In view of the fact that we are on the subject of expenditures connected with this resolution. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not true that this exposition is being financed locally, that the money has been arranged for, that the exposition is international in aspect, and that foreign countries are to be invited; and would it not be a reflection if the United States should not participate in the exposition?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHANNON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the gentleman not think that at the present juncture in this country, in view of the fact that there are so many million people in America unemployed and on relief, that it would be far better for us to give attention to our own people than to worry about the feelings of the people of some 29 nations of the world? Does the gentleman not think that we should recess this Congress now unless we have something more important to take up than a \$350,000 appropriation for this exposition?

Mr. SHANNON. Now the gentleman has made his second speech, by the interrogation method, in opposition to this resolution. I think an effort is being made by the administration to do everything mentioned by the gentleman; and I think the exposition would aid in furnishing the relief of which the gentleman speaks.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The heads of the various executive departments and independent offices and establishments of the Government are authorized to cooperate with the commissioner in the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits; to lend to the California-Pacific International Exposition, with the knowledge and consent of the commissioner, such articles, specimens, and exhibits which the commissioner shall deem to be in the interest of the United States to place with the science or other exhibits to be shown under the auspices of that corporation; to contract for such labor or other services as shall be deemed necessary, and to designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist the commissioner. At the close of the exposition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, the commissioner shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken, and any expenses incident to the restoration, of such property to a condition which will permit its use at subsequent expositions and fairs, and for the continued employment of personnel necessary to close out the fiscal and other records and prepare the required reports of the participating organizations, may be paid from the appropriation provided; and if the return of such property is not practicable, he may, with the consent of the department or branch from which it was taken, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, line 18, after the word "restoration", insert the words "modification, and revision."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The sum of \$350,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, of which sum not to

exceed the sum of \$125,000 may be expended for the erection of such building or group of buildings, and/or for the rental of such space, as the Commission may deem adequate to carry out effectively the provisions of this resolution; for the decoration of such structure or structures; for the proper maintenance of such buildings, site, and grounds during the period of the exposition. The Commission may contract with the California-Pacific International Exposition for the designing and erection of such building or buildings and/or for the rental of such space as shall be deemed proper. The remaining portion of the appropriation authorized under this resolution shall be available for the selection, purchase, preparation, assembling, transportation, installation, arrangement, safe-keeping, exhibition, demonstration, and return of such articles and materials as the Commission may decide shall be included in such Government exhibit and in the exhibits of the California-Pacific International Exposition; for the compensation of the employees of the Commission in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the payment of salaries of officers and employees of the Government, employed by or detailed for duty with the Commission, and for their actual traveling expenses and subsistence at not to exceed \$6 per day: *Provided*, That no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed plus such reasonable allowance for subsistence expenses as may be deemed proper by the commissioner; for telephone service, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, duplicating, and computing machines, their accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, uniforms, maps, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers and all other publications, ice and drinking water for office purposes: *Provided*, That payment for telephone service, rents, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and other similar purposes may be made in advance, for the hire of a passenger-carrying automobile, its maintenance, repair, and operation, for the official use of the commissioner, for printing and binding; for entertainment of distinguished visitors, and all other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Commission to fulfill properly the purposes of this resolution. All purchases, expenditures, and disbursements, under any appropriations which may be provided by authority of this resolution, shall be made under the direction of the Commission: *Provided*, That the Commission, as hereinbefore stipulated, may delegate these powers and functions to the commissioner, and the commissioner, with the consent of the Commission, may subdelegate them: *And provided further*, That the Commission or its delegated representative may authorize the allotment of funds to any executive department, independent office, or establishment of the Government with the consent of the heads thereof for direct expenditure by said executive department, independent office, or establishment for the purpose of defraying any expenditure which may be incurred by said executive department, independent office, or establishment in executing the duties and functions delegated to said office by the Commission; and all accounts and vouchers covering expenditures under these appropriations shall be approved by the commissioner or such assistants as he may delegate, except for such allotments as may be made to the various executive departments and establishments for direct expenditure; but these provisions shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit or permit any obligations to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated: *Provided*, That in the construction of buildings or exhibits requiring skilled and unskilled labor, the prevailing rate of wages, as provided in the act of March 3, 1931, shall be paid.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 5, line 3, after the word "of", strike out "\$350,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$250,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the observation has been made that, after all, the Committee on Appropriations has control of the amount. You ought not put on that committee the duty to curtail improper expenditures. The Committee on Appropriations is nothing in the world but the servant of this House. If you authorize it to appropriate \$350,000, it carries out your wishes, because you are directing what you want it to do.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. Does the gentleman know of an instance when it has ever failed to do so?

Mr. BLANTON. Very seldom; only in very rare instances. If you want to appropriate only \$250,000, now is the time to save \$100,000 and to tell the committee that you want to save \$100,000, because if you limit it the committee cannot appropriate more.

This \$350,000 is going to come out of the Treasury. It is tax money that comes out of the pockets of our constituents back home. They are sorely distressed already. Notice

what you are providing for in this resolution. I read from section 5:

The commissioner may employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary, and fix their reasonable compensation within the grades and rates of compensation fixed by the Classification Act of 1923.

That provides and authorizes salaries up to ten or twelve thousand dollars a year in certain instances because some such are paid under the Classification Act of 1923.

Then, further, I quote from this resolution:

Of this \$350,000, of which sum not to exceed the sum of \$125,000 "may" be expended for the erection of such building or group of buildings, and/or the rental of such space as the Commission may deem adequate.

That is, this \$125,000 does not have to be spent for a building. They do not have to spend a single dollar of it for a building unless they want to. It says they "may" do it within their discretion. Then notice this further—and I read from the bottom of page 5:

For the compensation of the employees of the Commission in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the payment of salaries of officers and employees of the Government employed by or detailed for duty with the Commission, and for their actual traveling expenses and subsistence at not to exceed \$6 per day.

Here, with people on relief, with people back home who have not had jobs for two and a half years, with their wives and little children hungry, you are providing for this \$350,000 gala event out there and providing that these fellows who are sent from Washington shall draw, in addition to their pay, \$6 a day for expenses. I wish all of the good people in my district back home could get \$6 a day.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment.

Now, I know a great majority of you colleagues feel that these expositions have to be provided for, notwithstanding depressions and hard times. I know you are going to have this one at San Diego and give money for it. Why do they not do as they did 20 years ago, have their splendid exposition and not call on the Government? Why do they not do as the gentleman from California said Mr. Lorimer advised they should do: "It is fine, but don't make it too big." That is what Mr. Lorimer said: "Don't make it too big."

Now, they are asking for \$250,000 from the State of California. Why is it not enough just to match it by the Federal Government? That is what I am asking you to do with this amendment. Let us keep that other \$100,000 in the pockets of the taxpayers back home and save \$100,000 for them.

Do you know where we are heading for? We are headed for national bankruptcy just as sure as you are listening to the sound of my voice, if we do not stop this eternal needless expenditure of public funds out of the Public Treasury. If we do not stop it, you are going into national bankruptcy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Under this administration only bankruptcy can follow.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it started way back yonder in the Harding administration, went through the Coolidge administration with some brakes on, but the brakes were taken off entirely during the Hoover administration, and if we do not stop it we are going right straight into bankruptcy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I cannot yield; I am sorry. I cannot yield. Naturally we have to vote for needed funds that the administration asks for, and we do it because we have confidence in the President; I know that he has got to furnish some relief; I know that he must provide work if we are to get rid of this dole—and that is what he is trying to do. I vote for the necessary administration propositions, but this

is not an administration matter. The President has not asked us to appropriate this \$350,000. Mr. Secretary Hull is the only man in the administration who has spoken, and he says as to the amount, "That is a matter for Congress to determine."

Why, they do not even have authority to invite a foreign country to participate until you pass this resolution. It is section 1 of this resolution which gives them authority to invite foreign countries, and Mr. Secretary Hull says that if you do pass it you can invite only those close by.

Now, we would be in a ridiculous situation to invite, for instance, France, to come over here, a nation which owes us money she will not pay, which owes us a solemn debt of honor but will not pay it. Think of inviting her to come here and have a good time. Or England who has not paid us what she owes. I do not want to invite them over here until they pay their honest debts. [Applause.] I want to see them pay this country. If they have not got the money, I want to see them come up like men and say, "We have not got it, but we owe it and we are going to pay it as soon as we can." Then I would feel like inviting them. I do not want to invite a single foreign country over here for anything until they acknowledge the lawful debts they owe.

I have done my duty; I have offered this amendment. I have tried to save \$100,000. I realize full well that I am making a futile fight. There are in all about 16 such proposals to appropriate Federal money for different expositions. Every Member here interested in an exposition will feel that if he does not vote for all of them, he will not be able to get money for the one he is interested in, hence I am afraid there will be very few votes for my amendment. I believe that all of them should rest on their own merit. And I am going to vote accordingly. I am going to vote to save this \$100,000.

Just when are we going to stop needless spending of public money? Just when are we going to begin to take care of the United States Treasury? We must make a start some time. I am in dead earnest about it. I feel that it is of such great importance that I am going to make a motion to recommit this bill, to reduce it \$100,000, and have a record vote on it, and see just how many Members there are here who are willing to vote to save \$100,000. The only way to get a record vote is on a motion to recommit.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is in accordance with the usual practice for the Federal Government to be represented at expositions of this kind. Every citizen of the Republic should desire that when we participate in these enterprises a showing should be made worthy of the Federal Government.

I sympathize with the gentleman from Texas in suggesting that proper regard for economy should be manifested in authorizing appropriations, but I entirely disagree with him as to the wisdom of cutting down this authorization of \$350,000.

What is the businesslike method of securing a proper representation of the Federal Government at this exposition? There is no proposal here that the Federal Government shall make any contribution for the general purposes of the fair. The only appropriation is for money to erect the building and provide for and maintain the exhibit of the Federal Government during the exposition. When this matter comes before the members of the Appropriations Committee they should, I think, apply to the Commission appointed to represent the Federal Government and listen to the advice of that Commission as to the amount that is required. That is the sane and businesslike method of deciding the question as to the proper amount to be provided.

In opposing the authorization of money for the participation of the Federal Government in this exposition one gentleman this afternoon referred to neglect or disregard of "suffering humanity." Let us think for a moment. We are just about to appropriate over \$4,000,000,000 for the purpose of aiding suffering humanity. One of the general policies that has been followed by this administration is to provide grants of 30 percent of certain classes of large appropriations, to

give that much as a free gift by the Government, to provide relief, encourage restoration, and provide employment. Here it is proposed the Federal Government shall appropriate only a fraction of that amount.

The appropriation of this money will contribute to the expenditure of between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000. All we ask is \$350,000 that the Federal Government may provide and maintain its own exhibit. If we wanted, therefore, to measure the worth of this appropriation from the standpoint of relief alone it would be just as defensible as any relief measure that has been passed by this House in the last 2 years.

The gentleman from Texas, to whom I referred, I think, in a way, misled or misinterpreted this proposal to the House. There is no suggestion here of any \$10,000 jobs. The \$6-a-day expense allowance is only what men are paid every day for expenses, and no part thereof is to be paid in excess of their necessary and actual traveling expenses in any case. The commissioners are to be men who are already paid regular salaries by the Government and are to be allowed no additional salaries.

Now, as to the question of San Diego being back here for another appropriation. That will not occur. When San Diego gave the former exposition she received not one dollar for the exposition from the Federal Government. She did not come to the Federal Government asking for any contribution. That exposition paid its own way, outside of the contributions the local people made. Large contributions have already been made for this exposition by the San Diego people. The coming exposition is headed by the experienced and able gentleman who conducted the former exposition, which will insure its success. California is willing for it to be understood that there is no proposal to come back here for any additional appropriation.

This exposition will help the whole country. The gentleman from Texas represents, I should say, one of the States that will benefit most through the passage of this authorization. Why? Because there is a great paved highway that leads from the State of New York to San Diego through the South and the Southwest, and there will be thousands, and perhaps hundreds of thousands of people traveling by machines through the State of Texas which has a broader expanse of territory than any other State of the Union can boast. Outside of California no other State will profit to so marked a degree.

This exposition will prove to be a stimulus to the business of the country. This is a sensible measure to afford relief and recovery.

So whether we judge this bill as providing a proper participation of the Federal Government in a splendid exposition, or as a measure of relief and recovery, it is worthy of the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas wishes by his amendment to reduce the possible appropriation that would be given to this exposition from \$350,000 to \$250,000.

The city of San Diego has not in its conduct to the Government been at all niggardly with our Government. In years past the city of San Diego has given more than one-third of its water front to governmental establishments and has asked nothing in return. The city of San Diego has given to the Government a piece of property upon which they built its naval hospital in the same Balboa Park where this exposition will be erected. The city of San Diego has given one of its most valuable pieces of property on Broadway to the Government for a tremendous warehouse, and there are many other items of value that the city of San Diego has given to our Government and has asked not a dollar in return.

I do not understand the logic of the argument that because the State of California has been asked to contribute \$250,000, this Nation should not contribute any more than an equal sum. Why, the State of California is nothing more than a one forty-eighth segment of this great Nation. Should not

this Federal Government contribute more than a State to an exposition of this character?

Mr. Chairman, if you deny this contribution on the part of the Federal Government to an international exposition to be held, we will create a precedent the like of which has never occurred in this House where our Government has refused to participate in an exposition of an international character.

It has been suggested that during a time of depression, of want and woe, we should not make expenditures of this character. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has gone the limit and will continue to go the limit to do everything possible for those needy souls who have been mentioned here on the floor of the House. Because we are in a depression, should we close up the Museum down here on the Avenue? Because we are in a depression, should we close up the great libraries and institutions of culture? Why, this is the very time that we need these places of mental rest and recreation. We have most need of them during the time of depression, and, if I understand the words of our great President in his several messages to the people of the United States, this is one of the very things that will carry out the purpose of our future plan for a great Nation. One of these purposes is that we shall have spots of recreation, because we expect to have more time of leisure.

So I beseech you not to cut down this appropriation by the adoption of this amendment, because I am reminded of the story of one of my friends, who tried to borrow a small sum of money from a bank. The bank said, "Yes, Mister; you can have all that you ask for except \$1,000." The man said, "It does not do me any good to borrow anything, if I cannot borrow the sum I first requested." Of course not.

Do not be niggardly, because the city of San Diego has never been niggardly to this Government or to the State of California. We will never come back and ask for a further contribution, and I consider this one of the great cultural assets of our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 94) providing for the participation of the United States in the California Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, under the rule, reported the same back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Is there any Member opposed to the bill who desires to offer a motion to recommit? If not, the Clerk will report the motion to recommit of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit this resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions that said committee shall report the same back forthwith with the following amendment, to wit:

"On page 5, in line 3, after the word 'of', strike out '\$350,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$250,000.'"

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 5, noes 102.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote because there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-eight Members present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 39, noes 307, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—39

Binderup
Blanton
Carpenter
Colmer
Crawford
Doxey
Eagle
Eicher
Fletcher
Ford, Miss.

Fulmer
Halleck
Hancock, N. C.
Hoffman
Hull
Jenkins, Ohio
Lamneck
Luckey
Ludlow
McClellan

McFarlane
Mitchell, Tenn.
O'Malley
Patterson
Pearson
Peterson, Ga.
Polk
Sanders, Tex.
Secrest
Tarver

Terry
Thom
Truax
Turner
Vinson, Ky.
Whittington
Wolcott
Woodruff
Young

NAYS—307

Adair
Allen
Amble
Andresen
Andrew, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.
Arends
Arnold
Ashbrook
Ayers
Bacharach
Bacon
Barden
Beiter
Bell
Blackney
Bland
Bloom
Boehne
Bollean
Boland
Bolton
Brennan
Brewster
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brunner
Buchanan
Buck
Buckbee
Buckler, Minn.
Bulwinkle
Burch
Burnham
Caldwell
Cannon, Mo.
Cannon, Wis.
Carden
Carlson
Carmichael
Carter
Cary
Castellow
Cavichia
Christianson
Church
Citron
Clark, Idaho
Clark, N. C.
Cochran
Coffee
Colden
Cole, Md.
Cole, N. Y.
Collins
Connery
Cooper, Ohio
Cooper, Tenn.
Corning
Costello
Cox
Cravens
Crosby
Cross, Tex.
Crosier, Ohio
Crowe
Crowther
Culkin
Cullen
Darden
Dear
Deen
Delaney
Dietrich
Dingell
Ditter
Dobbins

Dockweiler
Dorsey
Doughton
Drewry
Driscoll
Driver
Duffey, Ohio
Duffy, N. Y.
Duncan
Dunn, Miss.
Dunn, Pa.
Eaton
Eckert
Edmiston
Ekwall
Ellenbogen
Engel
Englebright
Fenerty
Fernandez
Fiesinger
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Focht
Ford, Calif.
Frey
Fuller
Gavagan
Gehrmann
Gifford
Gilchrist
Gildea
Gillette
Gingery
Granfield
Gray, Pa.
Green
Greenway
Greever
Gregory
Griswold
Guyer
Gwynne
Hancock, N. Y.
Harlan
Hart
Harter
Healey
Hennings
Hess
Hildebrandt
Hill, Ala.
Hill, Knute
Hill, Samuel B.
Hoepfel
Hollister
Holmes
Hook
Hope
Houston
Huddleston
Igoe
Imhoff
Jenckes, Ind.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones
Kahn
Kee
Keller
Kennedy, Md.
Kennedy, N. Y.
Kenney
Kerr
Kimball
Klinzer
Kleberg
Kloeb

Kniffin
Kocialkowski
Kopplemann
Kramer
Kvale
Lambertson
Lambeth
Lanham
Larrabee
Lea, Calif.
Lemke
Lewis, Colo.
Lewis, Md.
Lloyd
Lord
Lucas
Lundeen
McCormack
McGehee
McGrath
McGroarty
McKeough
McLaughlin
McLean
McMillan
McReynolds
McSwain
Maas
Mahon
Maloney
Mapes
Marcantonio
Marshall
Martin, Colo.
Martin, Mass.
Maverick
May
Mead
Meeks
Merritt, Conn.
Merritt, N. Y.
Michener
Mitchell, Ill.
Monaghan
Montet
Moran
Moritz
Mott
Murdock
Nelson
Nichols
O'Brien
O'Connell
O'Connor
O'Day
O'Leary
O'Neal
Owen
Palmisano
Parks
Parsons
Patman
Perkins
Pfeifer
Pittenger
Plumley
Powers
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin
Ransley
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rellly

Rich
Richards
Richardson
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, N. H.
Romjue
Rudd
Russell
Ryan
Sabath
Sadowski
Sanders, La.
Sandlin
Schaefer
Schneider
Schuetz
Schulte
Scott
Sears
Seger
Shanley
Shannon
Short
Sirovich
Sisson
Smith, Conn.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wash.
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
South
Spence
Stack
Starnes
Steagall
Stefan
Stewart
Stubbs
Sullivan
Sutphin
Sweeney
Taber
Taylor, Colo.
Thomas
Thomason
Thompson
Thurston
Tinkham
Tolan
Tony
Turpin
Umstead
Underwood
Utterback
Vinson, Ga.
Wallgren
Walter
Warren
Wearin
Weaver
Welch
Werner
West
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Pa.
Withrow
Wolverton
Wood
Woodrum
Zimmerman
Zioncheck

NOT VOTING—86

Bankhead	Dirksen	Hobbs	Pettengill
Beam	Disney	Jacobsen	Peyser
Berlin	Dondero	Johnson, Okla.	Pierce
Biermann	Doutrich	Johnson, W. Va.	Rayburn
Boylan	Evans	Kelly	Reece
Brown, Mich.	Faddis	Knutson	Robison, Ky.
Buckley, N. Y.	Farley	Lee, Okla.	Rogers, Okla.
Burdick	Ferguson	Lehlbach	Sauthoff
Cartwright	Fish	Lesinski	Scrugham
Casey	Gambrill	McAndrews	Snell
Celler	Gasque	McDuffie	Sumners, Tex.
Chandler	Gassaway	McLeod	Taylor, S. C.
Chapman	Gearhart	Mansfield	Taylor, Tenn.
Claiborne	Goldsborough	Mason	Tobey
Cooley	Goodwin	Massingale	Treadway
Cummings	Gray, Ind.	Millard	Wadsworth
Daly	Greenwood	Miller	Whelchel
Darrow	Haines	Montague	White
Dempsey	Hamlin	Norton	Wilcox
DeRouen	Hartley	Oliver	Wolfenden
Dickstein	Higgins, Conn.	Patton	
Dies	Higgins, Mass.	Peterson, Fla.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Biermann with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. McAndrews with Mr. Millard.
Mr. Boylan with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Dondero.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Reece.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Haines with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Patton.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Evans.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Wilcox.
Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Gray of Indiana with Mr. White.
Mr. Pierce with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Pettengill.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Berlin with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Claiborne with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. McDuffie with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Gassaway.
Mr. Peyser with Mr. Massingale.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Chandler.
Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma with Mr. Whelchel.
Mr. Hamlin with Mr. Farley.
Mr. Daly with Mr. Hobbs.

Mr. BLAND changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORRIS] had unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes after the disposition of the measure just passed. I now desire to ask unanimous consent that instead of proceeding for 10 minutes at this time the gentleman may address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader tell us what the program is to be for tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. My hope is we will take up the Private Calendar and finish its consideration tomorrow. There are 55 bills on the calendar, and there will probably be some other bills on the calendar by tomorrow. The rule requiring bills to be on the calendar for 3 days prior to

their consideration does not apply to this calendar, and therefore any bill on the calendar tomorrow will be entitled to consideration. I hope all the Members who have bills on this calendar will be present tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think we should restrict the making of speeches until we finish the Private Calendar tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think that would be entirely proper.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Pennsylvania had permission to address the House for 10 minutes this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I shall not object to this particular request.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the majority leader if there is any possibility of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill coming up tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have heard no suggestion about that at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE WEAKENS WITH UNEMPLOYMENT—
UNEMPLOYMENT NEUROSIS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks the other end of the Capitol has been debating the \$4,800,000,000 work relief bill. It is only natural that there should be every safeguard thrown around the spending of this money. It is only natural that the Members of Congress should be interested in the wise expenditure of this apparent large sum of money.

However, it is so easy for all of us to get our attention centered on one item and overlook other items bearing on the same fundamental issues. The other item I have in mind at this time is the item of \$12,000,000,000 spent in this Nation every 12 months in the ramification of crime.

In other words, Senator WAGNER reports that the Nation spent this huge sum in 1933 in dealing with crime. That means that every day in the year 1933 we spent \$33,000,000 looking after the different avenues of crime. Another way of putting it is that every hour in every day in 1933 the taxpayers of the Nation spent \$1,400,000 to care for crime activities.

Still another way of putting it is that the \$4,800,000,000 we are going to use to put men back to work is only a little more than one-third of what we will spend the coming year in taking care of the Nation's crime bill. Is it possible that we will halt between these two opinions? Is there any question as to the advisability of using \$1 to put men and boys back to work so as to save their health as against spending \$3 to coddle and care for crime activities?

We are spending these millions to control crime because those who have managed and manipulated our municipal, county, State, and National Government for the past 40 or 50 years failed to build a social and economic structure that functions. It is apparent on every side that we slowly drifted toward economic chaos, and in November 1929 we bumped into the Gibraltar that put our economic ship of state on the rocks.

We must admit that those who piloted the ship of state during the last 40 or 50 years failed to vision or see the rock of financial and economic destruction ahead of them. It is said that, like Shylock, the glitter of gold dimmed their vision, and where there is no vision the people perish.

It is easy for us to now see the bad workmanship and the flaws in the old machine that ran amuck in 1929. It is easy to look back and see where the defects were. It is easy to see that during the fat years from 1922 to 1929 how we failed to build our economic structure sufficiently strong to stand the storm. Like the *Macon*, when the cross winds beat upon her structure she crumbled and fell into the briny deep.

Our mission, my friends, is not to consume our energy in complaining about the past, but to build for the future, to build a social and economic fabric that will function in such a way that every man and woman will have an opportunity to work. That must be the mission of every State legislature, that must be the mission of the United States Congress, that must be the mission of all those entrusted with the reins of Government if we hope to perpetuate our sacred institutions.

To fulfill this mission we must enrich our citizenship-building institutions—the home, the church, and the school. We must ever remember that one of two things a nation must always do—pay small sums for the enrichment and upkeep of these institutions or pay large sums to battle crime and build prison walls.

The most alarming situation we have with us in the United States today has just been fully pictured by Dr. Majera, a noted physician. Dr. Majera finds that the unemployment has brought about a plague or a disease known as "neurosis." This disease has gripped millions of our population. He finds that the first phases of the illness resemble neurosenthia and include definite inorganic inferiority, and that treatment just strengthens the patients physically and that they remain mentally depressed and full of self worry. Also those suffering from unemployment neurosis become easy recruits of extremeness, communistic organizations, and gangster bands. Later on a certain percent of this group become murderers and robbers.

It has been observed that dole relief plunges hundreds of thousands of our people into the first stages of this dreadful disease, unemployment neurosis. It has further been found that the largest percent of those affected are young people. Friends, the only way we can keep this dreadful unemployment neurosis from destroying millions of our people physically and mentally is to create immediately a set-up that will put them back to work.

Mr. Speaker, Nero fiddled while Rome burned. We must not sit idly by and watch our fellow men be made victims of a malady that may permanently unfit them for life work. No one who is interested in the future generations wants to see dole relief continued. No one interested in our citizenship-building institutions wants to see dole relief extended to those who are physically able to do a day's work. The story of dole relief down through the ages in every nation, where it has been tried, teaches us that it always brings about disease, plagues, crime, and murder. I mean that those who are physically able to work should be given the opportunity to work, and those who are not physically able should be pensioned or put on charity. No red-blooded man is ready to admit that we cannot create an economic set-up that will give our people an opportunity to work.

If we had thought twice 2 years ago, we would have put 2,000,000 boys and men in the C. C. C. camps instead of 300,000. This dreadful disease of neurosis is not found among the C. C. C. boys, neither is it found among those older who have daily work. If we had put 2,000,000 men and boys to work on expanded C. C. C. projects, we would not only have saved the Nation billions of dollars in money during the past 2 years but we would have saved the next generation from being victims of the results of the aftermath of this unemployment disease.

Two million men and boys at work means 10,000,000 happy and contented people, because these men and boys come from unemployed homes and come from the ranks of the unemployed, and when they get the \$30 a month and send \$25 of it back home there is an independence and an attitude of mind present that makes for better citizenship and greater respect for law and order.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the big task before the Congress this very hour is to create a worth-while work program in the Nation that will put our unemployed back to work. Again, I wish to say that I am not in favor of the Government taking over any of the avenues of private business, but rather that the Government should encourage private business, so as to be able to absorb the unemployed men and women in their respective fields of industrial activity.

However, until such time it behooves the Government to create a work program, put these boys and men to work, and thus save the millions of unemployed from falling victims of this plague, unemployment neurosis.

OLD-AGE PENSION

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill I introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I do not wish to cast too great an unfavorable light upon the labors of the apparently well-qualified gentlemen who drafted the economic security bill now in committee. However, I feel that title I of this measure, providing for voluntary, noncontributory old-age pensions, is inadequate to meet the need for which it is designed. My reasons for so thinking are based largely upon the following data submitted by the President's Committee on Social and Economic Security:

First. There are about 700,000 people over 65 years of age on F. E. R. A. relief lists. In addition, there is an undetermined number in receipt of public charity, but not on F. E. R. A. lists. All told, the committee states, the number of old people in receipt of public charity is probably in excess of 1,000,000.

Second. Approximately 180,000 old people, most of them over 70 years of age, are now receiving pensions under State laws, the average pension last year being \$19.74 per month—over \$40,000,000 per year.

Third. Approximately 150,000 aged people are in receipt of industrial and trade-union pensions, the cost of which exceeds \$100,000,000 per year—or a little over \$60 per month.

Fourth. A conservative estimate is that at least one-half of the approximately 7,500,000 people over 65 years of age are dependent.

These four points have been the subject of much discussion, and it is with each of them in mind that I wish to explain my purpose in introducing H. R. 5700.

First, I believe that the prime object of voluntary, non-contributory old-age pensions should be the elimination insofar as possible of almshouses and the transfer of those aged on relief rolls to pension rolls. This would mean, according to the President's committee, a pension roll which would include over 1,000,000 persons.

In approaching this situation it might be wise to consider that in some sections of the country it may be found desirable to grant pensions as high as \$50 per month while less than half of this figure would be considered adequate in other sections. If we strike an average between the present low average of approximately \$20 per month paid by States and the maximum of \$50 per month which I propose, we arrive at the figure of \$35 per month. With 1,000,000 persons receiving such an amount per month the total cost would be \$400,000,000 per year, or, on the proposed basis of equal sharing of the burden by State and Federal Governments, \$200,000,000 annually for the latter.

Inasmuch as it is quite evident that many State legislatures are in favor of immediate action on old-age pensions, a large proportion of those now on F. E. R. A. relief lists will be transferred to pension rolls shortly following the enactment of Federal legislation, providing such legislation permits quick action. If this be true—and I am convinced that it is true—the immediate appropriation of \$50,000,000 provided in title I of H. R. 4142, the administration bill—and the later authorized appropriation of \$125,000 annually will be inadequate.

In suggesting the inadequacy of the proposed appropriations I have no desire to see the expenditure in this instance of more Federal funds than is necessary to provide decent housing and subsistence for the destitute aged. With the exception of the much-touted but economically impossible Townsend plan offered by my distinguished colleagues from the utopian land of California, I do not know of any

proposal which contemplates supporting old age in idle luxury. But let us, by all means, do what we can to eliminate the poorhouse and in its place provide a dependable and systematic method allowing those who cannot help themselves and who can turn to no other place but to a humane government, find moderate comfort and happiness in their declining years.

On the other hand, let us not provide pensions of this sort without also evolving means of paying for them without further borrowing on the public credit. A voluntary non-contributory-pension system should not and cannot depend for revenue upon a compulsory, contributory system which is based upon sound actuarial standards. No, we must make this thing pay its own way. Permanent revenues must be found to establish a permanent pension system.

It is natural that we all hesitate to suggest new taxation, but someone, at some time, must pay the bills—and I believe that if the burdens carried by present generations are lightened by social legislation, future generations should not be forced to carry additional burdens for which they will not be responsible and of which they cannot divest themselves.

Despite the objections with which my revenue-raising proposal will inevitably be greeted, I believe that the manufacturers' excise tax provided for in H. R. 5700 is also inevitable. Although I favor the use of nuisance taxes of diverse kinds in an emergency, favor equitable income taxes of all kinds, including income from the at present tax-exempt securities, and am in accord with increasing of inheritance and gift taxes, I could not conscientiously propose that an additional \$200,000,000 per year be derived from increasing any of these.

The manufacturers' excise tax should be in addition to any other tax now imposed and should be levied against any and all manufactured articles of whatever shape, size, or description, with the industry classifications for the census of manufactures, 1933, as a guide for assessments.

It is impossible to accurately determine the ultimate dollar volume of sales of all manufactured products. The f. o. b. factory value of all such articles in 1933 was about \$31,000,000,000. A 1-percent tax, therefore, could reasonably be expected to produce upward of \$350,000,000 per year, allowing little more than a 4-percent increase in dollar volume between producer and ultimate consumer.

Under the provisions of H. R. 5700, the President may change the rate of taxation so as to secure revenue in as near as possible the exact amount needed to provide funds for pensions. The bill calls for a 1-percent tax, but this amount could be reduced immediately to one-half of 1 percent and graduated upward as the need arose. Provision is also made for the exemption of very low-priced articles.

The proposed means for collecting this tax is, I believe, the most simple and effective which could be devised. It would not require an army of inspectors and the amount of the tax is so low for the average unit sale that collusion between seller and purchaser is unlikely.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest desire that adequate revenue be provided for whatever expenditures are to be made under a permanent plan of this character. This is not emergency legislation.

AMERICAN TRADITIONS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a statement made by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, in 1917 the international bankers, alien interests, and alien-minded Americans forced the United States to enter the World War, thereby abandoning its tradition of neutrality, which was its fundamental protection and immunity from war. Since then the United States has lost the character of its political institutions and has become an impoverished Nation.

The roots of nearly all of the present troubles of the United States go back to this abandonment of the American

traditions of neutrality and of nonparticipation in the political affairs of Europe.

During the last 19 months the United States more than the rest of the world has suffered catastrophic fluctuations and further protracted impoverishment.

Some idea of this further protracted impoverishment may be obtained from the following tabulation.

Country	Increase in national debt since 1929	August 1934 industrial activity compared with 1929 monthly averages
	Percent	Percent
Sweden.....	27.2	101.8
Great Britain.....	2.6	98.7
Germany.....	38.8	86.2
Canada.....	22.6	78.3
France.....	10.3	69.8
Belgium.....	11.6	68.7
Poland.....	3.8	62.2
United States.....	60.0	62.0

This tabulation shows that by comparison with other important countries the United States, since 1929, has shown the greatest increase in its Federal debt and has made the least progress toward recovery. The data on debt are obtained from official sources and the indices of industrial activity are those recently compiled by the League of Nations.

The discrepancy between the United States and other important nations is made more apparent by the following data of increase in industrial production from the low point in each country, as reported by the League of Nations:

Country:	Industrial production	Percent increase
Canada.....		63.8
Sweden.....		51.2
Germany.....		49.4
Belgium.....		37.8
Poland.....		33.3
Great Britain.....		26.4
United States.....		25.8
France.....		5.5

As additional evidence of the further impoverishment of the United States are the two following impressive facts recently reported by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration: (1) That there were approximately 17,000,000 persons "on relief" in September of 1934 as compared with 13,338,000 persons in September of 1933, an increase of 3,662,000 persons, and (2) that during September of 1934, \$143,000,000 of public funds were spent to support those "on relief", as compared with \$59,000,000 in September of 1933, an increase of \$84,000,000.

Another evidence of this further impoverishment of the United States are the unemployment figures for October of 1934, as compared with the unemployment figures for October of 1933. According to a report of the American Federation of Labor, in October of 1933 there were 10,122,000 unemployed; in October of 1934, 10,671,000, an increase of 549,000 persons.

These figures would seem to indicate a distribution of poverty rather than a redistribution of wealth.

Thus, the United States, having abandoned its neutrality and mingled in the political affairs of Europe, is becoming, like the countries of Europe, a pauperized nation.

A MOMENTOUS DECISION OF THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, as a newspaper man, consecrated to my profession through more than 40 years of service, jealous of all encroachments on its legitimate activities, I feel a genuine thrill of pride when I refer to a decision handed down recently by the Supreme Court of Indiana which in sum and substance is an epochal vindication of the freedom of the press.

Through the gracious kindness of my colleagues of the House of Representatives, I am conceded the privilege of inserting this decision in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where posterity may behold it and time will not efface it.

Don M. Nixon, of Wabash, Ind., was a fighting Hoosier editor. He was a Republican in politics but when it came to the hard but dutiful task of exposing errors, misconduct, and corruption in the public service his spear knew no brother. He upheld what he believed to be right and condemned what he conceived to be wrong, always standing for what he thought was the public interest. He was aggressive, dynamic, militant, and absolutely fearless, a colorful crusader for righteousness.

A judge appointed a village garage mechanic as receiver for a million dollar trust company. Editor Nixon did not think it was a fit appointment. In trenchant language he criticized the judge's act. He was cited for contempt. On the morning he was sentenced a crowd of townspeople and farmers overflowed the courthouse and corridors, including many who had lost their savings in the trust company and who showed by mutterings and sullen silence that they were on the side of the editor. He was fined \$100 and sentenced to 10 days in jail.

There was nothing malicious about Don Nixon, but he never quit fighting when convinced that his cause was righteous. He appealed his case to the Indiana Appellate Court. By this time the Nixon contempt case had become a *casus celebre*. The issue of freedom of the press had become identified with it in a big way. Metropolitan newspapers sent their correspondents to Indianapolis to report the proceedings before the appellate court. John Boettinger, who has since become the President's son-in-law, went down from Chicago to report the trial for the Tribune. The appellate court sustained the contempt decree of the lower court.

Don Nixon, still fighting, appealed his case to the Supreme Court of Indiana and carried to that highest of all tribunals in our State his plea for the liberty of the press that is the very bulwark of free government.

On January 9 last, James P. Hughes, the dignified, able chief justice, handed down the unanimous decision of the Indiana Supreme Court. That decision already has taken its place among the imperishable documents of a free people. In these times, when the newspapers are having their battles with N. R. A., and when administrative and judicial officials are none too mindful of the constitutional guaranty of free speech, the decision of the Indiana Supreme Court looms forth as a magna carta of the press. In clarity, force, and conciseness, the court's decree is without a parallel.

It says:

The right to comment freely and criticize the action, opinions, and judgment of courts is of primary importance to the public generally. Not only is it good for the public but it has a salutary effect on courts and judges as well.

Courts and judges are not, and should not be, above criticism, and as long as they are not impeded in the conduct of judicial business by publications having the effect of obstructing enforcement of their orders and judgments, or of impairing the justice and impartiality of verdicts, there is no right to enforce a contempt proceeding.

That decision has been praised from ocean to ocean by all the distinguished men of journalism, by the outstanding exponents of our ancient philosophy which we inherited from the founding fathers, and by the paladins of American ideals in every walk of life.

The tragedy of it all is that Editor Nixon did not live to witness the vindication that came to him so generously. Exactly 70 days before the court handed down its decision he died as the result of an auto-truck crash that fractured his skull.

Throughout the years to come every encroachment on the right of newspapers to criticize public officials will awaken reverberations of the gallant fight Don Nixon made in Indiana for freedom of the press, and the decision of the Indiana Supreme Court will be the restraining voice that will say to the courts:

Thus far mayest thou go, but no farther.

There has been in modern times only one other piece of judicial literature that in any way resembles the decree of the Indiana Supreme Court in this case, and that was the dissenting opinion of Oliver Wendell Holmes, of the United States Supreme Court, in the case of *Rosika Schwimmer*, when the venerable jurist said:

Some of her answers might excite public prejudice, but if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate.

LINCOLN-DAY TRIBUTE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by myself at a Lincoln Day banquet in Portland, Maine, on Lincoln's Birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

We are met here tonight to do honor to the first Republican President, and to revivify our belief in the principles of the Republican Party, a party conceived of liberty and freedom, and born of the principle that every man, regardless of race, color, or creed, is imbued with a God-given, inalienable right of freedom of thought and action in his lawful pursuits with freedom of the right to think, act, and live normally and without any more restraint by Government than is necessary to compel respect of the rights of others to live in like manner.

The Republican Party was organized primarily as a protest against the oppression of a race of people who had been retained in subjugation by the policies adhered to by the forbears of the present Democratic Party. This was recognized to be against all moral law. Great reforms were necessary not only to free these people from enslavement, but to rid the Union of certain other correlated but no less pernicious institutions which if allowed to continue would have nullified the pure intent of the founders of the Nation "to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln the Republican Party saved the Union; it emancipated, not only the colored race from physical enslavement, but all of our people from the constant threat of disintegration of the Nation contained in the insidious policies of the Democratic Party.

We are again called upon to safeguard the American people against similar pernicious policies of the present administration. American business, industry, agriculture, and finance must be freed from economic bondage, and it is only through a re adoption by the people of the policies of the Republican Party that this can be brought about. After every Democratic administration the Republican Party has been called back into power to rebuild the Nation upon the ruins resulting from the devastating and destructive experiments of a party which has proven itself incapable, in at least three instances, of maintaining a Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

It was intended by the framers of our Constitution that the Federal Government should be made up of three distinct but related branches—the executive, legislative, and judicial. Although it is always expected that the prerogatives of these departments will overlap in some respects, it was never intended that the definitely established constitutional functions of these departments should be delegated.

We have seldom seen an attempt on the part of the judiciary to usurp the prerogatives of the legislative or executive branches of the Government. There has never been any attempt on the part of the legislative branch of the Government to usurp any of the prerogatives or powers of the judiciary or executive branches, but in the last 2 years we have been visited with the paradox of the executive branch of the country, although disclaiming any attempt at usurpation of power and prerogatives of the legislative branch, doing so with the utmost disregard of the rights of citizens to be secured in a representative form of government. Lincoln met the Nation's greatest emergency by holding fast to the Constitution; the present administration is attempting to meet an economic emergency by ignoring the Constitution and has suffered rebuke from the Supreme Court in doing so.

How different the administrations of Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt! During the Lincoln administration this great progenitor of the Republican Party sought the advice of his political enemies as well as his personal and political friends. He surrounded himself with men of divergent interests and opinions, in order that he might be apprised at all times of the cross currents of public opinion and thought. He felt it his duty as a Chief Executive to coordinate these opinions, and when he enunciated a policy or made a recommendation to Congress it was done after careful consideration had been given to the reaction on the public mind and whether in keeping with the Constitution.

In this manner he gave full credence to the debates in Congress, because he realized that to do otherwise would deprive our citizens of the right to true representative government. As a consequence, he enjoyed the respect of his political enemies as well as his political friends.

In order that a republican form of government may be maintained under a Constitution such as ours, it is essential that the Chief Executive always maintain himself in a position of neutrality until complete information on the subject is obtained, and when he once comes to a conclusion it must be so definite in character as to leave no doubt in the minds of the people as to what his policy will henceforth be on that particular question. Lincoln did this.

Unlike Lincoln, the present Chief Executive has insisted that he be surrounded by "brain trusters" and bureaucrats who would divest themselves of all personal initiative in the advocacy of policies and the expression of personal opinions. He has insisted that the Congress of the United States, instead of being useful to him in the promulgation of his policies, follow the letter of his personal unbalanced conclusions without regard to the integrity of the Constitution and without regard to the people of the Nation who can be heard, as a result, only through the voice of Congress. He has flexed the Constitution to bring it within the scope of his own endeavors instead of subserviating his personal will to the Constitution, as Lincoln and all his predecessors have done. When criticized for it, the answer of administration leaders has been, "We cannot eat the Constitution." The rebuttal of Republicans has been, "True, but we have eaten under the Constitution for 146 years." While on one hand he has preached the doctrine of relief for the forgotten man, for the small merchant, and the farmer, he has insisted that the Congress scuttle its right to give consideration to legislation in behalf of these same individuals whom he has been so vociferous in protecting, and, with autocracy as his watchword, has destroyed representative government. There has been set up in its stead an autocratic oligarchy of supermen not responsible to any constituency, but responsible only to the will of the Executive.

This administration has taken advantage of the plight in which the American people found themselves due to a world-wide depression to foist upon them the same pernicious policies from which the Republican Party has protected our people since its origin in 1854. Our fight has just started. In substantiation of the charges which I have made and the necessity for continuing the fight for a restoration of a Republican form of government, let us, as Al Smith would say, "Look at the record." During the last 2 years this has been a record of destruction of American tenets and principles; it has been a record of inconsistencies; it has been a record of paradoxes the like of which has been unknown in the history of any organized government. Let us review some of these paradoxes:

While we are spending millions to effect crop reduction, we are, at the same time, appropriating other millions to irrigate land and make it available for the production of new farm surpluses; while we are paying the farmer to produce less, we are encouraging larger production by the circulation of Government periodicals advising the farmer how he may grow two stalks of grain where only one grew before. While private employers were importuned to raise salaries to increase purchasing power, the Government was decreasing wages paid the large army of Government employees and was making slashing reductions in the amounts paid to veterans to compensate them for loss of earning power due to service-connected disabilities.

While attacking the Republican tariff policy, which was designed to maintain the American market for Americans, and while they contended that the reduction in our foreign trade resulted from the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, they have put tariffs on coal, copper, and oil, not included in that act, and they have adopted such an elastic foreign policy that much antagonism has arisen on the part of foreign countries, which has caused a steady decrease in the value and volume of our exports. While boasting that under the policies of the "new deal" millions have been put back to work, at the same time giving recognition to the fact that the need for relief is greater now than at any time during the 2 years of the Roosevelt depression, by the insistence that \$4,800,000,000 be appropriated to carry this load. While the administration has been most vociferous in its advocacy of a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards, it cannot resist the temptation to follow its natural bent of constantly experimenting with monetary panaceas, even to the extent of adopting a sort of bimetallic base for our currency, without recognition of the fact that no major country in the world has had a bimetallic standard for the past 70 years.

While they have been dramatic in their insistence that the national credit be maintained by a Federal Budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, they have by the reckless expenditure of taxpayers' money built up the largest Government debt in the history of the United States, from a sum of about \$21,000,000,000 when the administration took office, to a sum now exceeding \$30,000,000,000, and with an anticipated increase of another \$7,000,000,000 within the next 2 years.

While dealing with the subject of paradoxes, I charge, without any equivocation, that the Democratic Party has broken faith with the people of the Nation. If further proof of this is required, let us turn for a moment to the platform of the Democratic Party adopted at Chicago in 1932. It is interesting to read the platform of the party now in power, in the light of what has

happened since the inauguration of 2 years ago. In that platform the Democratic Party solemnly state:

"We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when intrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe."

And then follows,

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government * * *."

In his acceptance speech at Chicago, following his nomination, President Roosevelt said that he stood four-square on the Democratic platform in this and all other respects. In further confirmation of his stand with respect to this particular part of the Democratic platform, President Roosevelt, at Topeka, Kans., on September 14, 1932, said, as follows:

"I propose to exert through the Presidency, as I have done through the governorship, every bit of influence I can in favor of a national movement to reorganize local government in the direction of eliminating a large part of the tax burden that now bears so heavily on the farmers of the Nation."

And again, in the same respect, he is quoted by the press as saying:

"By our example at Washington itself we shall have the opportunity of pointing the way of economy to local government * * *."

He then goes on to distribute tax dollars between the local, State, and Federal Governments, and concludes by saying:

"I propose to you, my friends, and through you, that government of all kinds, big and little, be made solvent, and that the example be set by the President of the United States and his Cabinet."

Instead of this, as I have pointed out, the costs of Government have arisen to the extent that we find ourselves in the position where there are only two alternatives, that of liquidation of our debt by pernicious and destructive inflation of the currency or by confiscatory taxation, which is equally destructive of business and property.

In his speeches before the election Mr. Roosevelt laments the fact that the tax burden is equivalent to \$125 per year per person. The per capita burden of Federal taxes has increased during the 2 years of his administration from about \$170 to about \$250. Using Mr. Roosevelt's own words:

"This is an impossible economic condition. Quite apart from every man's own tax assessment, that burden is a brake on any return to normal business activity. Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and hence in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain."

And again:

"Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continued deficits. Stop the deficits. And let us also have the courage to reverse the policies of Republican leaders and insist on a sound currency."

The inconsistency of the stand taken by the administration in reduction of governmental taxes is noted in the adoption of a 3-point program given by the administration to the press last Saturday, February 9, 1935, which includes among other things a high tax system, clothed in the garb of another experiment on the part of the administration to increase the velocity of money turned over in this manner. I presume this to be a concession to the "leftists" of the Democratic Party, who advocate a redistribution of the wealth of the country. If so, it is truly a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Let us turn again to the covenant of the Democratic Party, in which they contract with the American people further, as follows:

"We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue with a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference."

It is a long way from this covenant to the Democratic tariff act passed at the last session of Congress, which enables the President of the United States to raise or lower the tariffs 50 percent without even a hearing before himself or any other fact-finding body. The Republican Party has always kept its covenant with the American people to protect its agriculture and industry by a tariff high enough to prevent foreign competition resulting in the destruction of our home markets. Mr. Roosevelt recognizes in a speech at Baltimore on October 25, 1932, the necessity for a protective tariff on agricultural commodities, wherein he says:

"Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. I declared that all prosperity, in the broader sense, springs from the soil. I promised to endeavor to restore the purchasing power of the farm dollar by making the tariff effective for agriculture, and raising the price of farm products. I know of no excessive duties on farm products. I do not intend that any duties necessary to protect the farmer shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived."

It was undoubtedly because of this covenant that many of the farmers of the United States voted for this administration in 1932.

What has happened since? By the contrary policies adopted by the administration in the Democratic-controlled Congress our foreign markets are being lost to the American farmer. The administration has not kept this covenant with the American farmer. With respect to tariffs, let us cite one example: The President,

by Executive order under the authority of the tariff act, has increased the preferential on sugar coming in from Cuba by 1.1 cents per pound. He has reduced the world tariff rate on sugar one-half cent per pound. This sugar comes in direct competition with a sugar industry worth many millions of dollars to the American farmer. It will enable the owners of the Cuban sugar industry to market their quota of sugar for the year 1935, \$59,424,672 less than the year 1933. The action of the President was predicated upon a desire to increase the purchasing power of the Cuban people. The Cuban sugar industry is not owned by the Cuban people and has resulted in benefit to no one but those United States bankers who have large investments in Cuba, and it has increased by a like amount the money which the taxpayers of the Nation must raise to pay the operating expenses of the Federal Government.

And again the Democratic Party provides for "the removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest." It is not necessary to dwell at length upon the different activities of the present administration to bring the Government into direct competition with private enterprise. There has been such a socialization of American business as to make the followers of Marxism green with envy.

By again referring to the platform of the Democratic Party, we learn with amazement that they condemn the improper and excessive use of money in political activities. You Republicans here in Maine do not need to be reminded of the effective use made of the Federal Treasury in garnering votes at the last election for the Democratic Party. And in Washington today a movement is on foot to augment the resources of the Federal Treasury by the sum of \$4,800,000,000 which may be used as a political war chest for the 1936 elections. These breaches of faith and demagogueries on the part of the Democratic Party may be justified by the advocates of socialism, facism, Hitlerism, or communism. There is no place for them in Americanism. Let us take heed, and in revivifying our faith in Republican doctrines and policies, not lose sight of the fact that it is our duty to prevent the use of Federal funds for the destruction of an American form of government.

The present Democratic administration is indicted at the bar of popular opinion because it has not kept the covenant; because it has broken faith; because of its manipulation of the currency; because by a sectional attitude it has given to some sections of the country the advantages of cheap power not enjoyed by others; because it has launched upon a continuing program of experimentation and trial-and-error prescription for our economic ills; because it has not established a definite policy with respect to its attitude toward business and agriculture and maintained it long enough for business and agriculture to readjust itself to the new order of things; because of its failure to make an honest endeavor to approach a balancing of the Budget; because of its attempts at the centralization of governmental power and functions, reaching out, as it does, to control agriculture, business, industry, finance, and credit. It is charged with impairing the confidence of our people, not only in the policies of the administration, but in government itself. The Democrats cannot answer the charge that this lack of confidence is the result of difficulties except of their own making. "Lack of confidence is not the result of difficulties; difficulties come from lack of confidence." Shades of Lincoln! He is with us tonight and his spirit is telling us that as Republicans, ever solicitous of the Government for which he died, we must take up the torch of patriotism, of honesty, and intelligence, and warn the American people that unless we keep the faith, unless we again are put in a position where we can pilot the destinies of the Nation to a safe and sane port, the Union will disintegrate—in truth, crumble—its people will again return to a bondage and economic enslavement 10 times worse than physical servitude. This will result in another and even greater civil conflict, fought this time for the purpose of regaining the virtues of a republican form of government, of which we are fast becoming divested.

Is this an exaggeration? Then study the history of the French inflation preceding the French Revolution. Seek for the parallels of that era with those which we are now experiencing. First, deflation; next, unemployment; then charges of inadequate cash currency circulation; then artificial means of producing credit resulting in a topheavy credit structure controlled by the Government; then fear and panic; then further demands for more currency and the issuance of assignats; then seeming prosperity—everybody buying and buying—further flights from the franc, everybody turning their francs into commodities, shortage of labor, finally, saturation point, fear, unemployment in a high commodity market, and then revolution.

We do not need more cash currency to bring us out of this depression. The volume of cash currency does not control our economic life. It has little or no relationship to the price or turnover of commodities until it is issued in such huge quantities as to cause the people to become afraid of it, with a resultant desire to get rid of it, and then it is turned into commodities which usually causes the first reaction in the price index.

We do need in times like these an acceleration of the velocity of credit and credit currency. Agriculture and business improve only as our credit currency increases in velocity. Credit currency turns over only when there is a demand for expansion of business enterprise and farm commodities. There is a demand for expansion of business enterprise and farm commodities only when there is a market with the ability to buy. There is an expansion of all enterprise and attending market for the products of those enter-

prises only when there is confidence in the stability of the currency upon which the credit structure is built. A wheel within a wheel you say. True, no doubt; but an economic wheel which is at present on dead center and which can be put in motion only by overbalancing one side or the other; most effectively put in motion by creating a demand for credit which is now available. This demand depends chiefly upon the assurance which business and agriculture have that their profits will not be confiscated by the Government by wild monetary policies or by confiscatory taxation resulting from an unbalanced Budget and the charges attendant upon the carrying or retirement of a tremendously huge Government debt. There is little demand for loans against the more than \$1,800,000,000 of excess reserves in the Federal Reserve System, due to lack of confidence; out of \$300,000,000 made available as loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a year ago (an act designed by Congress to increase the velocity of credit) less than \$37,000,000 has been taken up by business because of the uncertainty which prevails as to the future economic policies of the administration.

Assure business and agriculture against these destructive forces, protect the American market against the importation of cheaply manufactured products and farm produce, a market which consumes more than 93 percent of the output of our plants and farms; assure the American merchant, manufacturer, and farmer that he will not have to meet the competition of government in business, and we will have a surprisingly rapid recovery. Allow business to meet business in open and fair competition, devoid of monopolies created by the Government, and business will create its own markets as it has always done with the help, but not in spite, of the Government. Remove from the President the power to put any business out of business by the reduction of the tariff on things which that business makes or grows, and we remove that fear of cheap foreign competition from business and agriculture and allow that business to normally expand. People are put back to work. They can buy the products of our farms. Our farmers can then buy the products of our factories, and shortly we find that by the application of sound, good, old-fashioned common-sense principles to business and agriculture the welfare load has been lifted, our people are no longer in want for the necessities and luxuries of life, and America is the place Lincoln would have it be.

A land of contented, well-educated, well-nourished, happy people. In summary, to bring this about we must insist with all the power at our command, as a party representing 46 percent of the voters of this Nation, that the administration remove the uncertainty and lack of confidence which now exists by enunciating and adhering to definite and honest-intentioned policies which will result in, first, the stabilization of our currency; second, the withdrawal by the Government from the competitive field of honestly conducted private business and industry; third, the reduction of its bureaucratic expenditures, and insistence upon an honestly balanced Budget; and lastly, that it safeguard, by adequate tariffs and embargoes, if necessary, our domestic market.

REFINANCING OF FARM MORTGAGES

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following resolution relating to remedial legislation for refinancing farm mortgages, passed by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska:

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Lincoln, February 9, 1935.

Hon. C. G. BINDERUP,

United States Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Find enclosed a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Nebraska House of Representatives memorializing Congress to issue \$3,500,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes to lift the mortgage on the old homestead. Nebraska has ever taken the lead during the past half century for currency reform in this Nation; nearly 5 decades has passed down through the corridors of time since William Jennings Bryan unfurled the banner of free silver.

Twenty-three years ago Senator Hitchcock led the fight in the United States Senate for the creation of the Federal Reserve bank, out of which we now ask the issuance of this currency to pay the mortgages on the farms of America. I believe that this program would be sound, for the reason that this currency is backed by the best security in the world, the food-producing farm lands of America.

Federal Reserve Bank System was used to finance the World War, billions of which has gone to Europe—never to return. It was used by the gamblers to drive the stock markets up in the days when we kept cool with "Cal"; and if the administration of Mr. Harding had not deflated this currency in 1921 to the detriment of the agricultural West, the farmer of today would not be in the predicament he is in. The real farmers of America want this Democratic administration now in power at Washington to forget about the N. R. A., A. A. A., and the rest of the alphabetical

bureaucracy now undermining the very foundation stones of our Government, and lead on for real currency reform. May we hope that Nebraska will again take this lead?

As a Democrat I represent Colfax County in the Nebraska House and trying to do my part to lead on for a good old Jefferson and Jacksonian democracy.

Yours very truly,

OTTO C. WEBER,

Forty-third District, Colfax County.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact remedial legislation for refinancing of farm mortgages

Whereas the farmers of the agricultural regions of the United States are financially disabled; and

Whereas many farm lands are heavily mortgaged and the farmers are hopelessly in debt and many will eventually lose their farms unless relief is given; and

Whereas the prosperity of the United States and its people are dependent upon the well-being of the farmer and his ability to purchase; and

Whereas the gateway to prosperity is the gateway leading from the golden fields of the great agricultural region of the Middle West; and

Whereas the farmer and his dependents cannot and will not spend while attempting to carry a heavy load of indebtedness; and

Whereas the prosperity of the agricultural regions of this country means the prosperity of the whole country, since the purchase of any machinery and any equipment as well as clothing and food will create such a demand that factories would reopen and employ more people; and

Whereas inflation would tend to enable the debtors to get out of debt and to make the whole country more prosperous, as it has done many times before in this country and is now doing in England and other countries; and

Whereas a mild inflation has helped the United States regain its property on numerous occasions and is now helping England and other countries to regain prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska in fiftieth legislative session assembled—

1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such remedial legislation as will provide for refinancing through the Federal farm-loan banks of the whole farm-mortgage debt at an annual interest rate of 1½ percent and an annual amortization charge of 1½ percent of the principal, with balance to be paid in not less than 10 nor more than 20 years; that the funds for this operation shall be obtained through issuance of some \$3,500,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes.

2. That a copy of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to each of the Congressmen elected in the State of Nebraska, and that our Congressmen and Senators be urged to use their best offices to prosecute the enactment of such legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

THE NEW HOMESTEADER

Mr. RANDOLPH. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the Record, and to include therein a letter addressed to a constituent of mine.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who is the letter from?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is a letter to a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday afternoon of this week the first family moved into one of the recently constructed houses on the Tygart Valley subsistence homestead. This Federal project is located in my home county of Randolph.

Frank J. Swecker, with his wife and one daughter, occupied for the first time their new home on that date. Mr. Swecker formerly was a woodsman, being at one time employed by the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.

His case is typical of hundreds of timber workers who have been taken out of an industry which once flourished in the mountains of West Virginia, but is now almost finished. Throughout the hills there are scores upon scores of deserted lumber villages. Such stranded populations have become a serious economic problem, and I commend the attention of all Members of Congress to the possibilities for rehabilitation under the homestead movement.

At this project other families are preparing to move in their houses as speedily as possible. I believe that this administration should do everything possible to hasten the decentralization of industry and population.

Herewith is a copy of the letter written to Mr. Swecker upon the occasion of his moving in:

Mr. FRANK J. SWECKER,

Tygart Valley Homestead, Elkins, W. Va.

MY DEAR MR. SWECKER: It has been brought to my attention today that you and your family are now occupying your new home at the Tygart Valley Homestead. I wish to congratulate you as the first of these new homesteaders who will become the residents of this project in Randolph County.

You and your fellow homesteaders have not only a splendid opportunity for a life of new usefulness, but as workers in a new movement you have a responsibility as well. As you till the soil, rear your family, and receive part-time work in industry, may rich blessings attend you. This entire homestead program, I hope, will be filled with far-reaching beneficial results.

Faithfully yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following speech of Representative HAMILTON FISH, Jr., at the annual Lincoln Day banquet of the Republican organizations of the State of Missouri, Colonial Hotel, Springfield, Mo., Tuesday evening, February 12, 1935:

I know of no issue that is more appropriate to discuss on Lincoln's birthday than the betrayal of representative and constitutional government by the Congress at the arrogant demands of Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States. It is the most important issue before the American people, and will probably be, together with unemployment and the destruction of business confidence, the main issue in the next Presidential campaign.

The House of Representatives voted practically to abdicate its legislative powers by granting the President \$4,880,000,000 without qualification or limitation. The control of the purse strings is the main reason for the existence of the Congress, and when the Congress voted to strip itself naked of its legislative powers it left its Members with no more clothing than Ghandi. The President of the United States, the Democrats admit, was the author of this disgraceful bill, and it was only on his urgent request that the very lifeblood of Congress—the control of appropriations—was turned over to him, and the constitutional liberties of the people entrusted to Congress by the founders of the Republic, and representative government itself was smashed.

The autocrat in the White House sponsored this vicious and un-American action, backed by the "brain trust" and others who do not believe in our representative form of government. They cannot dodge the responsibility for forcing through Congress, under a gag rule and by whip and spur, this legislation—an abomination of desolation. The American people were mesmerized by the Hauptmann trial and do not yet know the facts. I call upon the Republican Party to fight this infamous and unconstitutional surrender of the legislative powers of Congress to an alleged superman in the White House. I call upon the Republicans not to cease in their efforts to restore representative and constitutional government to the American people. I call upon the Republicans to present a united front to oppose every attempt to weaken or destroy representative government and to establish a dictatorial government similar to fascism, Hitlerism, communism, and every other alien "ism" except Americanism.

The shades of the famous Americans who lived in or came from the great pioneer State of Missouri, Thomas H. Benton, Frank Blair, close friend of Lincoln, Edward Bates, Attorney General in Lincoln's Cabinet, General Grant, General Sherman, and Speaker Champ Clark. The voice of former Senator James Reed is still a clarion call on fundamental Americanism. The shades of men famous in history who fought for the principles of parliamentary control over the purse strings, of John Hampden in England, Mirabeau in France, and James Otis and Patrick Henry in our own country. Why the principle of taxation without representation was the cause of the Revolutionary War.

A representative government divided against itself cannot exist. The government of our Nation cannot endure half autocratic and dictatorial and half free and constitutional. I do not expect the Government of the United States to fall, but I do expect that government by Executive orders subversive of the Constitution will be ended and that representative government under the Constitution will be restored and that constitutional government will cease to be divided.

It was a dark and evil day when the Democrats, driven like a lot of sheep in Congress, voted to destroy the foundation stones of the separate powers of the Federal Government, and helped set up some new form of government, whether fascism or Hitlerism of the right, or socialism or communism of the left—whatever it is, it is not Americanism. It is the duty of the Congress to legislate and of the President to execute the laws.

Has the flame of liberty burned so low that Members of Congress will sacrifice and betray their own constitutional rights and those of their constituents at the bidding of the White House? The new dealers must assume the responsibility for deliberately changing our form of government and giving uncontrolled power into

the hands of a superman or a benevolent despot. We Republicans and followers of Abraham Lincoln do not believe that our free institutions have failed and that it is necessary to set up an autocratic and dictatorial government. The Democrats in Congress have by their votes acted like rubber stamps and shown an incapacity and incompetence to legislate intelligently and within the bounds of reason and moderation. Every Jeffersonian Democrat who voted for this legislative monstrosity, hamstringing Congress, should be opposed in his own primaries.

The people back home never gave their approval or consent to a change in our form of government. Senator Couzens said that the man or men who wrote the bill as it reached the House ought to be shot. This is pretty harsh treatment, but I submit that at least they should be deported to Italy, Germany, or Soviet Russia, where free institutions and democratic governments have been abolished.

No administration in the history of our country has done more in the short space of 2 years to undermine our representative system of government, impair constitutional authority, and change our form of government without the consent of the governed. A subservient, cowardly, and partisan Congress has placed vast autocratic powers in the hands of President Roosevelt and his "brain trust."

No Republican has a better right than I to denounce the usurpation of legislative powers by the President, and the gradual creation of an autocratic and dictatorial form of government without the approval of the American people, but upon the advice and instigation of the "brain trust." In the early days of the administration I not only voted in Congress to give the President temporary emergency powers to help solve the unemployment situation but actually defended the President from the charge of wishing dictatorial authority. I voted for the N. R. A. as a temporary and voluntary measure. I had no idea that it would become permanent and compulsory, or that the Blue Eagle would become a Soviet vulture backed by coercion, spies, enforcement agents, and jail sentences. The N. R. A. has hampered and harassed industry by its drastic regulations and ukases and all but strangled the small business man. Business confidence has steadily evaporated.

The time has come to scrap the unworkable codes, if not the entire N. R. A., and retain only the minimum wages and maximum hours and the child-labor provisions.

Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad. President Roosevelt is obsessed with the idea of power—no longer emergency or temporary power, but permanent, autocratic, and dictatorial. It is a tragic development in his character and imperils not only his administration but the well-being of the people and the stability of the country. He is apparently guided by the maxim that "He shall take who has the power, and he shall keep who can." Already overburdened with work and garbed with vast autocratic powers which he has to delegate to his favorites or radical appointees, often not even Democrats, he is ever grasping for more.

The party of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, standing for popular government, however, cannot and will not be silent while fundamental American principles and the very framework of our representative system of government are being undermined and gradually destroyed by the President, the "brain trust", and other near socialists at Washington.

There has been a great deal of talk to the effect that the Republican Party should liberalize and humanize its policies. Some people have said that this should be done by the national committee. The record of the Republican Party will be formulated, shaped, and made by the votes of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and the Republican Senators, and not by the Republican National Committee.

The Democratic Members of the House, at the opening day of the session, destroyed the rule to discharge committees of legislation which was the very essence and cornerstone of liberalism. Liberalism in Congress means the right to govern yourself, to think, to act, and to vote for yourself as an elected representative of the people back home. Liberalism is the extension of democracy, the right of the people to govern themselves, which was the fundamental political faith of Abraham Lincoln.

The Democrats' discharge rule is an utterly reactionary, fraudulent, unworkable gag rule and a political trick aimed to prevent consideration on the floor of legislation in the interest of the plain people, who Lincoln said God must have loved, because he made so many of them, which does not have the consent or blessing of the President and the "brain trust." All but a handful of Republicans voted against the obnoxious and reactionary gag rule.

Let us stop all the reactionary propaganda within the Republican Party about repealing direct primary laws, blocking child-labor measures, and opposing social-security legislation. The unmistakable mandate of the last election is that the Republican Party must humanize and liberalize its policies and leadership and make a direct appeal to the younger element by giving them real representation in our party councils.

The old guard, reactionary, ultra-conservative element of our party, met their Waterloo on November 6. A liberalized Republican Party is a political necessity forced by events, economic conditions, and the times, and not a meaningless death-bed repentance. The only chance for the Republican Party is to come out openly for progressive and liberal principles within the compass of the Federal Constitution, steering clear of socialism, communism, Government ownership, regimentation, collectivism, and a huge super-bureaucracy at Washington. Our appeal must be made equally to Jeffersonian Democrats and Abraham Lincoln Republicans to uphold and defend popular government and the fundamental American

principles of government advocated by both Jefferson and Lincoln.

There is no party today to speak for Jeffersonian principles except a liberalized Republican Party that will not compromise with the unsound, socialistic, and other destructive features of the new deal.

For well over a hundred years Jeffersonian Democrats have battled for their principles until the advent of this administration. Jeffersonian Democrats for all these years have boldly proclaimed their political creed, which stood for the rights and liberties of the individual citizen under the Constitution, for economy, for State rights, and against the concentration of powers in the Federal Government to interfere with either the rights of private business or the liberties of the individual. Abraham Lincoln once said he had obtained all of his political principles from Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence. The first two Republican platforms quote the Declaration of Independence.

Let us reaffirm our faith in the early principles of the Republican Party when it stood squarely for human rights as being superior to property rights and, as Lincoln said, "Labor is prior to capital." Let us build a bridge so that millions of deceived, disgruntled, and disgusted Jeffersonian Democrats may cross over to a liberalized Republican Party and help elect a Republican President in 1936 and restore representative government to the people.

The Republican Party was founded as a progressive party, and lip loyalty will be of no avail at the present time. What is needed is the loyalty of heart by application of the principles of Abraham Lincoln to the living issues of today. Lincoln was a progressive as compared to Buchanan but compared to John Brown and Wendell Phillips, a conservative.

The Republican Party today must be progressive as compared to the reactionary and ultra-conservative viewpoint of the recent past, but as compared to Franklin D. Roosevelt, the "brain trust", and Marxism it must be conservative, particularly on the fundamental principles of government and the Constitution.

The Republican Party must come out squarely for a parity for farm prices, which is impossible under the N. R. A., and insist on an equilibrium between the products of the farm, the factory, and the mines. We cannot have a prosperous America without fair prices for our agricultural products, and prosperous American farms depend on the cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the farmer.

There can be no prosperity for the farmer or wage earner until sound principles and common sense prevail in Government. The way the Democratic Party is proceeding to squander the resources of the Nation and trying to borrow its way out of the depression, there will be no return to prosperity until a Republican President is elected. And that will be in 1936, just as soon as the people wake up to the facts and have an opportunity to register their will regardless of relief work or the governmental pay rolls.

The Democratic administration has no policy except borrowing, more borrowing, and still more borrowing, leading straight to chaos, ruinous inflation, and bankruptcy. In another year the interest charges alone on the national debt will amount to well over a billion dollars and will consume over one-third of our revenue. The day of reckoning is inevitable, and approaching rapidly. The President, however, continues to smile, even if the ship of state is headed for the financial and economic rocks, and, like the French King, Louis XIV, says, "I am the state. After me the deluge."

That is small satisfaction for the American people and for the oncoming generations that must carry the burden of taxation and pay the bill for the devastating failures and experiments of the all-ambitious President and his "brain trust."

We have entered into an era of nostrums and cure-alls, enlivened by governmental day dreamers, economic magicians, business wand wavers, industrial snake charmers, agricultural rabbit producers, and free-trade crystal gazers. This new development is the natural consequence of an administration that has brought to Washington inexperienced and visionary professors and radicals of all kinds and description who care nothing for the experience and wisdom of the past that has made for the greatness of our country, but seek to perform new experiments and operations regardless of the cost to the Federal Treasury, the economic stability of the country, and the gigantic burden to the Federal taxpayers. This is what the "brain trust" has done to us. Now every quack doctor in the country, counting billions like millions, rushes in to outdo the "brain trust" to solve the depression by spending more money and lifting the American people up by their bootstraps.

There never was a time when the sound policies of the Republican Party were more needed in America than today before the "brain trust" and quack medicines have destroyed the economic lifeblood of the American people and caused a collapse of credit, ruinous inflation, governmental bankruptcy, and thrown millions more of industrious and loyal Americans out of work.

The tragedy of the present economic situation is that every day since last May unemployment has been increasing, so that today there are 12,000,000 unemployed, or more than 2,000,000 more unemployed, according to the American Federation of Labor, than there were a year ago. The fact is that after 2 years of socialistic experiments and unsound new-deal measures, business confidence has been destroyed and 12,000,000 American wage earners are walking the streets or depending on charity or doles.

I indict the Democratic administration on its record for the past year as the greatest failure in American history. I charge it with having destroyed business confidence, squandered American resources, and with impairment of the national credit. I accuse it

of having imposed unsound, unworkable, and socialistic measures upon the Nation that have increased the cost of living, impoverished the American people, and increased unemployment. I denounce it for undermining our free institutions, turning the Constitution into a scrap of paper, and changing our representative form of government, without the approval or consent of the American people, into an autocratic and dictatorial form of government.

I condemn it as having no economic policy except to pile debt upon debt by borrowing, more borrowing, and still more borrowing, without any thought of balancing the Budget or of the inevitable day of reckoning and collapse of credit and bankruptcy of the Government.

New-deal prosperity apparently means the country out of business and both the Democratic Party and the Government in business. It means debts, deficits, taxation, borrowing, unbalanced Budget, confidence destroyed, and American labor unemployed. The various departments of the new deal are honeycombed with radicals, Socialists, and near-Communists, and contributors to communism for the purpose of instigating strikes, riots, sabotage, industrial unrest, and to promote class hatred and teach hatred of the American flag.

Excessive taxation, Government competition, an unstable currency, and harrasing legislation has put a stop to industrial progress and private enterprise. Ask the man on the street, the worker in the shop, the mechanic, the clerk, or the physician if he has more money in the bank than he had 3 years ago. The hospitals, the public libraries, the art galleries, and educational institutions, most of which have been largely built by the generosity of private individuals, are becoming things of the past. The stream cannot rise higher than its source, so it is with the financial stream when the Government dries it up.

I believe in the American industrial system, based on private initiative and reasonable profit, which has made for the wealth and the greatness of our country and for the well-being of our wage earners, which are the freest on earth.

The Republican Party believes in the sanctity of private contracts and private property and is opposed to the extension of Government ownership. The attitude of the Republicans toward private property is the same today as it was in 1864, when Lincoln wrote the following words before the Workingman's Association in New York:

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another but let him work diligently and build one for himself, and thus for example assure that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

The Democratic Party, President Roosevelt, and Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a free trader and an advocate of the League of Nations, are determined and obsessed with the idea of forcing the United States to become involved and entangled in foreign intrigues and controversies. The Republican Party believes that America should avoid all foreign entanglements, stop passing moral judgments on other nations, keep out of all foreign boundary disputes and ancient blood feuds, refuse to police the world and, above all, mind its own business.

We have plenty of problems to solve at home, which require our best efforts and undivided attention.

Secretary Hull has only one economic policy, and that is to break down the protective principle that has made our wage earners the best paid, the best housed, the best clothed, the best fed and most contented in the world. The American standard of wages and of living are of little consequence to this confirmed free trader, provided he can put into effect his visionary ideas to break down world economic barriers. All that he can possibly accomplish will be to permit competition from the underpaid labor of Europe and Japan, particularly the latter, paid less than 20 cents a day, to the detriment of free American labor.

The Democratic Party proposes, by Executive order, to enter into bargaining tariffs which will soon result in the destruction of the economic supremacy of the United States and in putting millions of more loyal Americans out of work for the benefit of European and Japanese labor. The protective-tariff system, since the days of Lincoln, has built up our industries in all our western cities, such as St. Louis, Chicago, and Kansas City. The attitude of the President imperils the welfare of our workingmen. American labor declines to compete with the poorly paid and cheap labor of Europe or Asia or the forced labor of Soviet Russia.

Senator Nye, a Republican Senator from North Dakota, is to be commended for his investigation of the traffic in munitions of war. The United States must not become the potential slaughterhouse of the world or the symbol for arms and munitions, backed by the dollar sign. I am in favor of taking the profit out of war by control of all munitions plants and through the drafting of wealth, industry, labor, and man power in event of war. If we must ever have another war, it must be in defense of America and not in defense of war profiteers and munitions makers.

Speaking in the great State of Missouri, I would be derelict if I did not refer to the Americans of German origin who are among our most industrious and loyal citizens and have done so much to build up our country. Under Sigel and Carl Schurz they supported Lincoln and fought for the preservation of the Union. The greatness and prosperity of St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul is due in large measure to the thrift and honest industry of the German population. Americans of German descent all over the United States are forces for good citizenship and a bulwark against communism and those who would destroy our American institutions.

The Republican Party for 80 years has stood for equal opportunity and equal rights for all, and, with Lincoln, that no man should be discriminated against on account of race, color, or creed. It was Lincoln the Emancipator who, by a stroke of his pen, made effective that essential principle of the Declaration of Independence which reads: "All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, namely, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." He found the colored men and women chattels and he left them with human souls as free American citizens.

Having served as an officer in a colored volunteer regiment, from New York, on the battlefields of France, and as one who is proud of their valor, I call on the colored citizens of Missouri and the Middle West not to desert the party of Lincoln for a mess of pottage or doles to the Democratic Party that stood for slavery, the auction block, the chain gang, and that does nothing now to prevent lynching and disfranchisement in the South.

The Republicans must oppose all unsound legislation, wild experiments, and advocates of Marxism. I have an abiding faith in the future and destiny of America. I have an abiding faith in the intelligence, judgment, and patriotism of the American people. They may be temporarily led astray by false leaders, but they will never depart for long from the principles upon which our Government was established by Washington, preserved by Lincoln and the Republican Party, and under its leadership and such courageous Americans as Theodore Roosevelt has become the greatest Nation on earth.

I did not come out here to outline a party platform, but I suggest the return to responsible party government on a sound, liberal, constructive Republican platform, conservative on the fundamentals of government such as the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and legislative powers of Congress, and forward looking in its treatment of new economic conditions in the interest of both the American farmer and laborer. Both the farmer and laborer should receive a greater share in the profits of their labor under a modified system of capitalism.

The Republican Party can well afford, when in doubt, to go back to the plain people of Abraham Lincoln and learn from them. The common sense of the American people, who in peace create wealth and in war carry the muskets of the Republic, is an infallible guide. It was the source of Abraham Lincoln's wisdom. He said, "I have faith in the people. Let them know the truth and the country is safe."

Abraham Lincoln belongs to the Nation, and to the world, as one of its greatest characters, but we must not forget the indisputable fact that he was part and parcel of the Republican Party and the foremost expounder of its principles and doctrines. He was the undisputed leader of the party as he is the soul of the Republican Party today. The name of Lincoln signifies to every American schoolboy that the humblest in origin and wealth can rise to the heights of earthly power and renown through his own efforts.

The Republican Party today needs leadership of the type, character, and ideals of Abraham Lincoln. Let us infuse the spirit of Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt into a liberalized and humanized Republican Party. Let us invoke the faith in the people that Lincoln loved and the faith of Theodore Roosevelt in popular government, and a square deal for the American people as the guide and cornerstone for the rebirth of a militant Republican Party. Let us refuse to compromise with false doctrines, unsound socialistic measures, or with any form of alien dictatorship, or the undermining of the Constitution of the United States, which Lincoln believed was the whole law and the prophet of free government.

Let the Republicans, in the words of Lincoln, have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it and to highly resolve that a nation conceived in liberty and a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth. Let us neither ask for any quarter nor give any quarter, but go forward without fear or favor for the preservation of American institutions on a sound, liberal, and militant Republican platform to victory in 1936, and the election of a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOBBS, at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, for 1 day, on account of important business.

To Mr. OLIVER, at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, for 1 day, on account of death of a friend.

To Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, for 5 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, at the request of Mr. KEE, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2030. An act authorizing the States of Washington and Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a free high-

way bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho;

H. R. 2874. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Eleven Points River in section 17, township 23 north, range 2 west, approximately 12 miles east of Alton, on route no. 42, Oregon County, Mo.;

H. R. 3018. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 3057. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oklahoma to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Arkansas River south of the town of Sallisaw in Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties at a point approximately 15 miles north of Keota in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 3891. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Waccamaw River at Conway, S. C.;

H. R. 3983. An act to legalize a bridge (known as "Union Street Bridge") across the Dan River at Danville, Va.; and

H. R. 4018. An act to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States;

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 15, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

217. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

218. A letter from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the second annual report of the Board covering operations for the year 1934, (a) of the Federal Home Loan banks, (b) the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, (c) the Federal Savings and Loan Division, and (d) the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from organization to December 31, 1934 (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

219. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1935, for the Department of Agriculture, for salaries and expenses (fighting and preventing forest fires), Forest Service, amounting to \$2,348,000 (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

220. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, under the Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal year 1936 in the sum of \$121,940 (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

221. A letter from the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a preliminary report covering the charges for electricity to domestic and residential consumers in cities having a population of 50,000 or more; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of an accumulation of documents and files of papers in the Department of Commerce which are not needed nor useful in the transaction of current business; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 135. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Federal Communications Commission to investigate and report on the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and on all other companies engaged directly or indirectly in telephone communication in interstate commerce, including all companies related to any of these companies through a holding-company structure, or otherwise; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5444. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3982. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4527. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE of Maryland: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1190. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 607. A bill for the relief of Florence Overly; with amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 760. A bill for the relief of John L. Hoffman; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 805. A bill for the relief of Luther M. Turpin and Amanda Turpin; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 918. A bill for the relief of Flensburger Dampfer-compagnie; with amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 923. A bill for the relief of Theresa M. Shea; with amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 928. A bill to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the George A. Fuller Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of General Warehousing Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of James P. Spelman; with

amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1030. A bill for the relief of Arthur Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1032. A bill for the relief of Joe G. Baker; with amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1291. A bill for the relief of the Muncy Valley Private Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of H. A. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Rose Burke; with amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Harbor Springs, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1550. A bill for the relief of Douglas B. Espy; with amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1609. A bill for the relief of R. A. Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1771. A bill for the relief of Pauline Fornabaio; with amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1830. A bill for the relief of Julia Santiago; with amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of William J. Ryan, chaplain, United States Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Jacobson; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of William E. Fossett; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4366) granting a pension to Estella May Duckworth and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 5693) to authorize the erection of a United States veterans' hospital in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H. R. 5694) adding a new section to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act approved January 22, 1932, as amended (Public, No. 2, 72d Cong.), to authorize loans and the purchase of bonds or other obligations to aid in the refunding, refinancing, or retiring of the outstanding indebtedness of unincorporated

tax or special assessment districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho (by request): A bill (H. R. 5695) to amend the act of March 1, 1879, chapter 125 (20 Stat. 351), as amended by the act of March 3, 1883, chapter 121, section 1 (22 Stat. 488), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 5696) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide, by agreement with the State of New Mexico, for maintenance and operation on newly reclaimed Pueblo Indian lands in the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., reclaimed under previous act of Congress, and authorizing an annual appropriation to pay the cost thereof for a period of not to exceed 5 years; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 5697) to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 and amendments thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) for the erection of a public building at Charleston, Tallahatchie County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) to add certain lands to the Pisgah National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 5700) to eliminate the hazards of destitute old age, direct the creation of a systematic method of establishing old-age pensions, to raise revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5701) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near La Fayette, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5702) to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 5703) to provide for the printing and distribution of Government publications to the National Archives Establishment; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. NICHOLS: A bill (H. R. 5704) providing for an additional judge for the eastern district of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 5705) to require certain documents of vessels not wholly owned by citizens of the United States and navigated in the territorial waters of the United States, its Territories or its possessions, to regulate vessels engaged in the fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLAIBORNE: A bill (H. R. 5706) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 5707) to ratify and confirm the corporate existence of the city of Nome, Alaska, and to authorize it to undertake certain municipal public works, including the construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvement of its sewers and drains, fire-fighting system, streets and alleys, sidewalks, curbs, and gutters, and a municipal building, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5708) to provide for unemployment relief through development of mineral resources, to assist the development of privately owned mineral claims, to provide for the development of emergency and deficiency minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 5709) for the erection of a public building at New Albany, Union County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5710) for the erection of a public building at Ripley, Tippah County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 5711) to provide pensions for the needy blind persons of the District of Columbia, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 5712) to provide for the prevention of soil erosion, for control of floods, for irrigation, for organizing and constructing hydroelectric plants, for building dams and reservoirs, for marketing electrical energy to States, counties, municipalities, corporations, and individuals, for the establishment of recreational centers and parks in all areas drained by the Arkansas River and its tributaries, which will include areas in the States of New Mexico, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Missouri, and for other beneficial purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GEHRMANN: A bill (H. R. 5713) to amend the postal laws relating to the appointment of acting postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5714) to exempt pensions from Federal income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5715) to exempt a limited quantity of cotton produced by small producers from the cotton-ginning tax under the Cotton Act of 1934, to authorize transfers or assignments of exemption certificates under such act outside the county, to provide for the payment of compensation to operators of cotton gins who incur additional expenses by reason of the operation of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 5716) to amend subsection (d) of section 116 of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes", approved May 10, 1934, being the Revenue Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARRABEE: A bill (H. R. 5717) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5718) to provide for a census of unemployment, employment, occupations, and population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5719) to provide for the cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories in equalizing the benefits of public education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5720) to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5721) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to the training, attendance, and participation of the equestrian and modern pentathlon teams in the Eleventh Olympic Games; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5722) to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 5723) to give certain railway postal clerks the same time credits for promotion purposes as were given others who were promoted on July 1 when automatic promotions were restored; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 5724) to authorize naval and Marine Corps service of Army officers to be included in computing dates of retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 5725) to provide for registration of persons employed to advocate or oppose legislative measures and to regulate the method of such advocacy or opposition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5726) to fix the staple length of exempt cotton at 1¼ inches and longer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 5727) to regulate the hours of employment of women employed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PIERCE: A bill (H. R. 5728) to prohibit the use of the mails for the taking of a straw vote; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5729) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty" to include officers assigned to duty at submarine training tanks and diving units, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5730) to amend section 3 (b) of an act entitled "An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy with respect to the categories of vessels limited by the treaties signed at Washington, February 6, 1922, and at London, April 22, 1930, at the limits prescribed by those treaties; to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes", approved March 27, 1934; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) to amend in certain particulars the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve", as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 5732) to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for books for the adult blind; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5733) to create an industrial commission on Negro affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAVERICK: A bill (H. R. 5734) repealing section 701 of the Revenue Act of 1926, and remitting the special excise tax therein provided and all penalties and interest which may have been heretofore incurred by reason of the failure to pay said excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5735) providing for the labeling, marking, and tagging of all boots and shoes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 5736) for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 5737) to extend the benefits of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act to provisional officers whose commissions did not become permanent, and who are otherwise eligible under the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEARIN: Resolution (H. Res. 110) for the appointment of a select committee of the House to investigate the Macon disaster and the advisability of constructing additional ships of similar type; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COX: Resolution (H. Res. 111) requesting certain information from the Secretary of the Treasury pertaining to the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WARREN: Resolution (H. Res. 112) to pay to Malvina Beckett, widow of William C. Beckett, 6 months' compensation, and not to exceed \$250 funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DOXEY: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 165) to lower the tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 166) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Unalaska Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LUDLOW: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 167) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the declaration of war and the taking of property for public use in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 168) to set up a national defense committee to study and report

on national defense generally; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 169) directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives the cause or causes for the high prices of agricultural implements and machinery; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) temporarily suspending tariff duties in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, supporting the Lemke bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, regarding the construction of a road through the Okefenokee Swamp to the Florida line; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, regarding the furnishing of aid to school districts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 5738) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Schreiber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5739) granting a pension to Agnes Metcalf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 5740) for the relief of May C. Jacobson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEITER: A bill (H. R. 5741) for the relief of William F. Caplick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) for the relief of William T. Reese; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5743) for the relief of Robert D. Doherty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5744) to authorize the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Tom Silver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 5745) for the relief of Antonnette Kara; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 5746) to authorize the removal of the bar of the statute of limitations with respect to certain taxes paid by Milton Kasch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARMICHAEL: A bill (H. R. 5747) for the relief of Gordon McGee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5748) for the relief of J. S. Smith and J. W. Smith, a firm doing business under the name of J. G. Smith & Sons, of Mount Hope, Lawrence County, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5749) for the relief of Mrs. MacDermott Meggitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5750) for the relief of Mary Brown Raley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 5751) granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Col. John A. Lockwood, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 5752) to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, to the dependent beneficiaries of Dr. Frank W. Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Edith H. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H. R. 5754) for the relief of Emma M. Pearson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUTRICH: A bill (H. R. 5755) to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Joseph A. Rudy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5756) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Rinehart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5757) for the relief of Charles C. Kerns; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5758) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 5759) for the relief of Marie B. Neale; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GINGERY: A bill (H. R. 5760) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Weber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H. R. 5761) granting an increase of pension to Drusilla Barnhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to Dr. George E. Holtzapf; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOOK: A bill (H. R. 5763) for the relief of John Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5764) to compensate the Grand View Hospital and Dr. A. J. O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 5765) granting a pension to Anna C. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEY: A bill (H. R. 5766) granting compensation to Raymond F. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 5767) for the relief of Budd M. Clymer; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 5768) for the relief of Peter Haan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5769) granting an increase of pension to Alma H. Aultman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5770) for the relief of Samuel Marion Hann; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5771) for the relief of Flora Jacobs, administratrix of the estate of A. L. Jacobs, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of Raphael Levy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 5773) to authorize a preliminary examination of Coquille River and its tributaries in the State of Oregon with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5774) to authorize a preliminary examination of Rogue River and its tributaries in the State of Oregon with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5775) to authorize a preliminary examination of the Siuslaw River and its tributaries, in the State of Oregon, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5776) to authorize a preliminary examination of Yaquina River and its tributaries, in the State of Oregon, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5777) to authorize a preliminary examination of Siletz River and its tributaries, in the State of Oregon, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 5778) to authorize the General Accounting Office to allow credit in the accounts of J. R. Lusby, disbursing officer of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 5779) for the relief of Edward DeForest King; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY: A bill (H. R. 5780) for the relief of Edward C. Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5781) for the relief of the widow and next of kin of James J. Curran; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'MALLEY: A bill (H. R. 5782) providing for the advancement in rank of Frederick L. Caudle on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5783) for the relief of Homer H. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDS: A bill (H. R. 5784) granting a pension to William L. Dickerson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H. R. 5785) granting a pension to William Betts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5786) granting a pension to Cinda Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SECREST: A bill (H. R. 5787) granting a pension to Sarah R. Beggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 5788) granting a pension to Helen M. Crowley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTPHIN: A bill (H. R. 5789) for the relief of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER: A bill (H. R. 5790) for the relief of certain creditors of J. R. & J. A. Whelan, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 5791) for the relief of the San Francisco Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 5792) for the relief of Alfred Burton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 5793) for the relief of Lovaura Schmidt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 5794) for the relief of Theodore Bedard, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1159. By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of interested citizens of Illinois, advocating the passage of a national old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1160. By Mr. BELL: Resolution of the Austrian Workmen's Association, Inc., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of the Lundeen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1161. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the municipal committee for the relief of home owners, New York City, urging the appropriating of additional funds for the Howe Owners' Loan Corporation, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1162. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of Art Dahling, commander, and L. J. Twedt, adjutant, and members of the Harold T. Swenson Post, No. 612, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, mostly all citizens of Fergus Falls and vicinity in Minnesota, urging the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates and the cancellation of accrued interest on existing loans on said certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1163. Also, petition of D. C. Goodsell, commander, and 70 members of Post No. 157 of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, all citizens of East Grand Forks and vicinity in Minnesota, urging the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates, together with cancellation and refundment of all interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1164. By Mr. CARTER: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging the Congress to remove the excessive taxation on wine made in this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1165. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, State of California, memorializing Congress to provide compensation in lieu of taxes for certain lands of the United States within the borders of the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1166. By Mr. COLE of New York: Petition of the members of the Central New York Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Ithaca, N. Y., signed by T. J. McInerney, chairman, and Claude Baldwin, secretary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1167. Also, petition of members of the Holy Name Society of St. Patricks Church, Corning, N. Y., signed by M. A. Flynn, president, and others; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1168. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Gloversville Council, No. 265, Knights of Columbus, protesting against the

persecution and oppression of the Mexican people by the National Revolutionary Party of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1169. Also, petition of group 614 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Amsterdam, N. Y., requesting the enactment of House Joint Resolution 81; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1170. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of 100 persons residing at or near Natural Bridge, N. Y., favoring the Townsend plan of old-age insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1171. Also, petition of 252 persons residing at or near Natural Bridge, N. Y., favoring the Townsend plan of old-age insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1172. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Federal Government to undertake an engineering project for the purpose of taking steps to preserve the beauty of the Niagara Falls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1173. By Mr. DEEN: Petition of the Georgia State Legislature, memorializing the Members of Congress to enact proper legislation whereby funds will be available for building a road through the Okefenokee swamp in Georgia to the Florida line, with Lake City, Fla., as a terminus or objective; to the Committee on Roads.

1174. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Atlantic Avenue Improvement Committee of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging that Public Works Administration funds be allocated to eliminate the grade crossings on Atlantic Avenue in Brooklyn and construct a boulevard on its surface; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1175. By Mr. DEROUEN: Petition of citizens of Evangeline Parish, La., urging passage of House bill 2856, an old-age-pension bill by Representative WILL ROGERS; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1176. Also, petition of citizens of Hammond, La., urging support of House bill 100, restoring benefits to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1177. By Mr. DOUGHTON: Memorial of the Legislature of North Carolina, memorializing Congress to enact legislation to take the profit out of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1178. By Mr. DUFFY of New York: Petition of the Rochester Parent-Teacher Council, urging the enactment of legislation to provide for supervision over the selection and treatment of subject material used in the production of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1179. By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of B. F. Wagner and numerous other residents of Woodbury, Bedford County, a part of the Eighteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, supporting House bill 3977, the Townsend bill, for the relief of the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1180. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution of the Municipal Association of South Carolina, favoring the appropriation of funds sufficient for the continuance of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1181. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the City Council, Tacoma, Wash., urging that Congress immediately change the Air Mail Act so that the present experienced operator, United Air Lines, can operate the Pacific coast route from Seattle to San Diego permanently, subject to all regulations governing air mail lines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1182. Also, petition of the New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., representing 90,000 members, urging the Office of Education in the United States Department of the Interior to establish a national film institute to encourage visual education by means of motion pictures, and otherwise stimulate the State departments of public instruction; to the Committee on Education.

1183. By Mr. HAINES: Resolution of the chamber of commerce, Gettysburg, Pa., pledging support to bills introduced for erection of memorial highway from Washington to Gettysburg and erection of statue of Abraham Lincoln in

Gettysburg National Cemetery; to the Committee on the Library.

1184. Also, petition signed by certain citizens of York, Pa., recognizing the contribution by Dr. George E. Holtzapple in the administration of oxygen gas to the first pneumonia patient, and also petitioning the Congress for due recognition by the awarding of a medal to Dr. Holtzapple; to the Committee on the Library.

1185. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Hon. William McCraw, attorney general of Texas, Austin, Tex., favoring passage of the Connally oil bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1186. By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Petition of 150,000 residents of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Maryland, relative to pension legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

1187. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, urging Federal and State legislation that will protect workers from unemployment; to the Committee on Labor.

1188. By Mr. KNUTSON: Resolution of Brainerd Division, No. 28, of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, endorsing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100, 73d Cong.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1189. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of the Springer Post, No. 83, American Legion of Waterville, Kans., urging the immediate payment of the veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1190. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Helen M. Peterson, of 2039 Collingswood Road, and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging the continuance of the Nye munitions investigation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1191. Also, petition of Elizabeth T. Sterner, of 1535 Menlo Park Place, and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging the continuance of the Nye munitions investigation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1192. By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth General Assembly and Senate, Denver, Colo., in behalf of bills establishing a 6-hour day and 5-day week for labor in industry; to the Committee on Labor.

1193. Also, petitions of certain citizens of Saguache County, Colo., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1194. Also, petition of certain citizens of Alamosa County, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for a direct Federal old-age pension of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1195. Also, petition of certain citizens of Las Animas County, Colo., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1196. Also, petition of certain citizens of Rio Grande County, Colo., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1197. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of group no. 194 of the Polish National Alliance, Buffalo, N. Y., memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Library.

1198. Also, petition of the Parent-Teachers' Association of New York, requesting the Education Office of the Department of the Interior to establish a national film institute to encourage the production, distribution, and exhibition of motion pictures for visual education and for suitable entertainment to meet the needs in rural and urban centers; and that Congress pass legislation which will provide for super-

vision over the selection and treatment of subject material used in the production of motion pictures during the process of making them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1199. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, requesting that the Federal Government be memorialized to make available to the several drought-stricken counties of western and northern New York sufficient hay and other roughage so that the farmers may maintain their herds throughout the winter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1200. Also, petition of the City Council of San Diego, Calif., requesting immediate and permanent repeal of national legislation which would remove the present operator, United Airlines, from the San Diego-Seattle route after March 1, 1935; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1201. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, requesting that the Hamilton Avenue-Governors Island Battery vehicular tunnel project be included in the Federal public works; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1202. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, requesting the Congress of the United States to expedite the passage of House bill 6, authorizing the Postmaster General to construct underground pneumatic tubes for the transmission of mail between the general post office at Brooklyn and the Floyd Bennett Field, Barron Island, and the five postal stations lying between these two points—namely, stations Times Plaza, B, Flatbush, Kensington, and Vanderbilt; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1203. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, requesting Congress to adopt the unemployment and social security bills and recommendations as proposed by Senator WAGNER; to the Committee on Labor.

1204. Also, petition of the Young Ladies' Sodality of St. Gerard's Roman Catholic Church, Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the treatment of the Catholic Church in Mexico and that the acts of Josephus Daniels, United States Ambassador to Mexico, were unwarranted and un-American, and that the President be hereby directed to reprimand the said Ambassador for his action and speech; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1205. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Tacoma, Wash., requesting Congress to change immediately the Air Mail Act so that the present United Airlines can operate the Pacific coast route from Seattle to San Diego permanently, subject to all regulations governing air mail lines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1206. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of certain citizens of Cave City, Ark., urging enactment of House bill 2856, the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1207. Also, petition of certain citizens of Jackson County, Ark., urging passage of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation, known as the "Pope plan"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1208. Also, petition of certain citizens of Smithville, Ark., urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma, known as the "Pope plan", for direct Federal old-age pensions to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1209. Also, petition of Ella Waugh and other citizens of Stone County, Ark., urging the enactment of an adequate old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1210. By Mr. MONAGHAN: Petition of 20 citizens of Stevensville, Mont., favoring the old-age-pension bill (H. R. 2856); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1211. Also, memorial no. 1 of the Senate of the State of Montana, protesting against the reduction of the duty on manganese; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1212. By Mr. O'MALLEY: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, urging the Congress of the United States to conduct an investigation into the acts and practices of the natural-gas utilities, their subsidiaries, and financial interests, to determine whether or not Milwaukee or

other central western cities have been deprived of natural gas through the activities of monopolistic corporations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1213. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Oshkosh, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to favor immediate and full payment of adjusted-compensation certificates, commonly called the "soldiers' bonus"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1214. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of the Charles Wescott Post, No. 173, American Legion, Bath, N. Y., presented by E. M. Blakley, commander, whole-heartedly endorsing the provisions of House bill 1, with the belief that it complied with the mandate of the Miami convention, and disapproving the provisions of the Vinson bill as not having been in accord with the national mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1215. Also, petition of Frank Wood, Asle H. Clark, and 208 other citizens of the United States veterans' hospital, Fort Harrison, Mont., for enactment into law of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1216. Also, resolution of Enid Chapter, No. 6, of the Disabled American Veterans, Enid, Okla., favoring the enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1217. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, New York City, concerning the proposed silver legislation; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1218. Also, petition of Atlantic Avenue Improvement Committee of Brooklyn and Queens, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging Public Works Administration funds for the elimination of grade crossings and creation of a boulevard on Atlantic Avenue; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1219. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of some 62 citizens of Lyndonville, Vt., and vicinity, endorsing the Townsend plan of old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1220. Also, petition from Ezekiel Simmons and some 30 others, of Orleans, Vt., requesting passage of House bill 2856 for Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1221. By Mr. REED of New York: Memorial of Kenmore (N. Y.) Philatelic Society, urging that the Post Office Department issue a set of imperforated stamps, similar to those now in the hands of certain dealers, as a square deal to all; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1222. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, through its chief clerk, favoring the enactment of legislation by Congress for the purpose of establishing and constructing all-weather post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

1223. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Central Civic Association, Hollis, Long Island, N. Y., concerning the continuation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and additional appropriations for same; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1224. Also, petition of La Salle Council, No. 454, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., regarding conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1225. Also, petition of the Western Union Cable Employees Association, New York, concerning the communications merger; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1226. Also, petition of National Council of Business Mail Users, Inc., New York City, regarding a 2-cent postal rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1227. Also, petition of the Assembly, Legislature of the State of New York, concerning the Wagner old-age pensions and benefits to needy dependent mothers and children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1228. Also, petition of the Senate, Legislature of the State of New York, urging that consideration be given amendments to the War Risk Insurance Act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1229. Also, petition of the Senate, Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the United States Department of Agriculture to make available to the several drought-

stricken counties of western and northern New York sufficient hay and other roughage so that the farmers of such counties may maintain their herds for the rest of the winter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1230. Also, petition of the Senate, Legislature of the State of New York, concerning a vehicular tunnel from Hamilton Avenue, Brooklyn, to lower Manhattan via Governors Island, such project to be included in the Federal public works; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1231. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, regarding the enactment of such laws or to authorize the promulgation of such rules by the Department of Justice or the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel every manufacturer of firearms to mark such firearms manufactured with a serial number which will be plainly visible, such serial number to be registered with the Department of Justice as to its consignee at the time of its shipment by the said manufacturer, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1232. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, endorsing House bill 8100; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1233. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich., endorsing unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1234. Also, petition of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, approving old-age pensions for noncitizens as well as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1235. By Mr. SCHAEFER: Petition of citizens of Granite City, Ill., protesting religious persecutions in Mexico, and asking recall of Ambassador Josephus Daniels for misrepresenting sympathies of the American people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1236. Also, petition of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, favoring enactment of the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1237. Also, petition of the Farmers Equity Union, Greenville, Ill., recommending favorable consideration of the Frazier-Lemke bill, the Jones commodity-exchange bill, and other legislation favorable to farm interests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1238. Also, petition of citizens of Nashville, Washington County, Ill., supporting an old-age-pension plan, sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pope, president the National Old Age Pension Association, as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1239. Also, petition of the Chicago Fur Workers Union, Local No. 45, asking repeal of the 10-percent excise tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1240. Also, petition of citizens of Duplo, Ill., supporting an old-age-pension plan, sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pope, as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1241. Also, petition of citizens of Smithboro, Bond County, Ill., supporting an old-age-pension plan, sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pope, president the National Old Age Pension Association, as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1242. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, of Charleston, W. Va., opposing the passage of all legislation seeking to impose a Nation-wide maximum 30-hour-work week; to the Committee on Labor.

1243. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of citizens of Spencer, Boyd County, Nebr., asking Congress to enact legislation affecting star routes that will eliminate competitive bidding as a means of securing contracts for the transportation of mail on star routes, also to provide adequate compensation for the services of star-route contract carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1244. Also, petition of the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact remedial legislation for refinancing of farm mortgages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1245. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of New Jersey Chapter, No. 1, Knights of Columbus, regarding the actions and utter-

ances of the Ambassador to Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1246. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of citizens of Chattooga County, Ga., urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 per month to persons over 55, independent of participation by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1247. Also, petitions of W. T. Travis and 45 other citizens of Walker County, Prof. S. O. Williams and 34 other citizens of Murray County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1248. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from citizens of Tiffany and other towns of La Plata County, Colo., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, providing for an old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1249. By Mr. TURNER: Petition of citizens of Humphreys and Lawrence Counties, Tenn., urging the enactment of the old-age-pension bill approved by Dr. J. E. Pope; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1250. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Lithuanian Supreme Lodge, of Youngstown, Ohio, by their secretary, John Carpar, demanding the enactment of a Federal system of genuine unemployment insurance as contained in the Workers' Act (H. R. 2827) in order that their future and the future of all workers, farmers, professionals, and other unemployed and their dependents may be more secure; to the Committee on Labor.

1251. Also, petition of the Citizens' Wholesale Supply Co., by their treasurer, R. P. Thomas, Columbus, Ohio, expressing approval of House bill 33, covering a proposed reduction of the present \$2 tax on industrial alcohol to \$1.10 per proof gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1252. Also, petition of Rev. M. M. Brown, Cleveland, Ohio, and other citizens belonging to the Glenville Townsend Club, protesting the gag rule and requesting a hearing of the Townsend plan in Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

1253. Also, petition of the Citizens' Wholesale Supply Co., Columbus, Ohio, by their treasurer, R. P. Thomas, urging that no change be made in House bill 3981, feeling that it is almost equivalent to having barriers put up at the State lines, and that if this small break is permitted it will be but a short time until other breaks may be made until the law is practically ruined; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1254. Also, petition of the Lithuanian Workers Association, of Youngstown, Ohio, by their secretary, F. J. Madiron, demanding the enactment of a Federal system of genuine unemployment insurance as contained in the Workers' Act (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

1255. Also, petition of Guy Boyer and other members of the Townsend Old Age Revolving Pension Club, of Napoleon, Ohio, urging support of the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1256. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution of Group No. 1625 (Turner Falls, Mass.), Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, for the designation of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1257. By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the Rochester Parent-Teacher Council, of Rochester, N. Y., urging the Department of the Interior to establish a national film institute to encourage the production, distribution, and exhibition of motion pictures for visual education, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1258. Also, petition of the Batavia, N. Y., branch of the New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., urging the Department of the Interior to establish a national film institute to encourage the production, distribution, and exhibition of motion pictures for visual education, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1259. By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of various citizens of Missouri, praying Congress to enact old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1260. Also, petition of the House of Representatives, State of Missouri, Fifty-eighth General Assembly, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate

relief funds for the purpose of establishing and constructing all-weather post roads; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1261. By Mr. ZIMMERMAN: Petition of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, urging Congress to speedily pass legislation appropriating unemployment or relief funds for the purpose of establishing and constructing all-weather post roads; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1262. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Science Foundation, Kansas City, Mo., regarding the payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1263. Also, petition of the American Science Foundation, regarding the payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1935

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, at whose word man goeth forth to his work and to his labor until the evening; direct us in all our doing with Thy most gracious favor; make us ever mindful of the great responsibility of service in this realm of our high calling; and so lead us by Thy spirit's gentle voice along our tangled way that we take each advancing step only in obedience to high thoughts inspired of Thee, lest our day become a weary waste of hours, and Thy people be disappointed of their hope. Thus into Thy holy keeping we commit ourselves, our spirits, souls, and bodies, ever conscious of the love vouchsafed to us through Thy blessed Son, our Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1935, when, on request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the California Pacific International Exposition, to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor; and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution of the United States.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Costigan	King	Reynolds
Ashurst	Couzens	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Cutting	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Davis	Logan	Schall
Balley	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahay	McCarran	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McGill	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McKellar	Stelwer
Black	Frazier	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	George	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gerry	Metcalf	Townsend
Bulkeley	Gibson	Minton	Trammell
Bulow	Glass	Moore	Truman
Burke	Gore	Murphy	Tydings
Byrd	Guffey	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Nye	Walsh
Carey	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Clark	Hayden	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson	Pope	
Coolidge	Keyes	Radcliffe	